

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES

3 3433 06823849 6

HT AND RELIGION

JAMES WILLIAM LOWBER

THOUGHT AND RELIGION

or

The Mutual Contributions of Philosophy and Theology

JAMES WILLIAM LOWBER,

M. A., PH. D., D. C. L., LITT. D., L. L. D., P. S. D., F. R. G. S.,
M. R. A. S., F. R. A. S., AND F. A. A. A. S., ETC.

MEMBER OF ROYAL SOCIETIES CLUB,
LONDON, ETC.

What a man's philosophy is, that his theology will be. If you find a materialist in philosophy you are certain to find one in theology; if you find an idealist in philosophy, you are certain to find one in theology. It is also evident that a man's theological views have a great influence upon his philosophy.




BOSTON

RICHARD G. BADGER

THE GORHAM PRESS

Toronto London Melbourne

*Copyright 1912 by James William Lowber
All Rights Reserved*



The Gorham Press, Boston, U. S. A.

To
my wife,
Maggie Pleasant Lowber

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION.....	5
I.	THE CONTRIBUTION OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY TO THEOLOGY.....	11
	<i>The Pre-Socratic Philosophy—Socrates —Plato—Aristotle</i>	
II.	THE CONTRIBUTION OF ROMAN PHILOSOPHY TO THEOLOGY.....	22
	Section One: <i>The Philosophy of the Stoics in Rome. Sayings of the Stoics</i>	
	Section Two: <i>Epicureanism in Rome</i>	
	Section Three: <i>Eclecticism in Rome</i>	
III.	THE CONTRIBUTION OF NEOPLATONISM TO BOTH PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.....	33
IV.	THE CONTRIBUTION OF SCHOLASTICISM TO BOTH PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.....	41
V.	THE MUTUAL CONTRIBUTION OF FRENCH PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.....	52
	Section One: <i>Sensationalism in France</i>	
	Section Two: <i>Religious Philosophy in France—Eclecticism in France</i>	
VI.	THE CONTRIBUTION OF GERMAN PHILOSO- PHY AND THEOLOGY.....	60
	Introduction— <i>Spinoza</i>	
	Section One: <i>Leibnitz</i>	
	Section Two: <i>Kant</i>	
	Section Three: <i>Hegel</i>	
VII.	THE MUTUAL CONTRIBUTION OF ENGLISH PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.....	70
VIII.	THE MUTUAL CONTRIBUTION OF SCOTCH PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.....	77
	<i>Thomas Reid—Dugald Stewart—Sir Wil- liam Hamilton—Thomas Chalmers</i>	
IX.	THE MUTUAL CONTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.....	84
	<i>French Philosophy in America—German Philosophy in America—English Phi-</i>	

CONTENTS

	<i>osophy in America—Scotch Philosophy in America</i>	
X.	THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY UPON MARTIN LUTHER'S THEOLOGY.....	91
	<i>The Influence of Scholasticism upon Luther's Theology—The Influence of Mysticism on Luther's Theology</i>	
XI.	THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY UPON SWEDENBORG'S THEOLOGY.....	97
	<i>Swedenborg's Philosophy—Swedenborg's Theology</i>	
XII.	THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY UPON JOHN CALVIN'S THEOLOGY.....	101
XIII.	THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY UPON JOHN WESLEY'S THEOLOGY.....	107
	<i>The Influence of Scholasticism upon Wesley's Theology—The Influence of Mysticism upon Wesley's Theology</i>	
XIV.	THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY UPON ALEXANDER CAMPBELL'S THEOLOGY...	113
XV.	THE CONTRIBUTION OF PHILOSOPHY TO THE NEW THEOLOGY.....	120
	<i>The Supernatural—The Supernatural in Creation—The Supernatural Character of Christ—The Nature of Divine Revelation—The True Doctrine of Inspiration—The Philosophy of the Atonement—The New Theology and Comparative Religion—Buddhism and Christianity—Mohammedanism and Christianity</i>	
XVI.	THE CONTRIBUTION OF PHILOSOPHY TO THE HIGHER CRITICISM.....	142
	<i>Who Wrote the Pentateuch?—The Christology of the Pentateuch—Who Wrote the Psalms?—Christology of the Psalms—Who Wrote Jonah?—The Christology of Jonah—Who Wrote Isaiah?—The Christology of Isaiah—Who Wrote Daniel?—The Christology of Daniel—The Contribution of Philosophy to the Higher Criticism of the New Testament</i>	

CONTENTS

XVII. CHRISTOLOGY, THE ULTIMATE PHILOSOPHY.. 160

Section One: *Christ's Interpretation of God—The Divine Personality—The Transcendence of God—The Immanence of God—God as a Father—The Attributes of God—The Essence of God*

Section Two: *The Universe Created by the Logos—Through the Logos God Created the Physical Universe—God Created Life Through the Logos—God Created Man Through the Logos*

Section Three: *Christ, the True Interpreter of Man*

Section Four: *God's Rerelation Through the Logos*

Section Five: *Christology the Ultimate Social Philosophy—Christ and the Family—Christ and the State—Origin of the State—The Progress of the State—The Divine Mission of the State—Our Duties to the State—Christ and the Church—Christ and Society—Will there be a Social Millenium?*

XVIII. CHRISTOLOGY, THE ULTIMATE THEOLOGY... 192

Are the Ideals of the Christ Adapted to the Twentieth Century?—Christ's Ideals of God

Section One: *The Supernatural Works of the Christ—The Ideal Life—Leprosy and Sin—The Miracles of Christ and Demonology—The Nature-Miracles—The Fourth Gospel—Feeding the Five Thousand—The Sabbath Cure at Bethesda—Jesus and the Blind Man—The Raising of Lazarus—The Risen Christ*

Section Two: *The Divine Teacher—The Divine Teacher at the Well—The Woman a Missionary—Spiritual Food—The Harrest—Jesus the Christ—Jesus and Abraham—The Divine Teacher of*

CONTENTS

the Good Shepherd—The True Shepherd—Jesus, the Door—The Good Shepherd—Other Sheep—Reflections—The Divine Teacher on Humility—Jesus Washing the Disciples' Feet—Simon's Objection—The Lesson of Humility—The Divine Teacher Warning Judas and Peter—The Traitor Pointed Out—Tender Words—Peter's Denial Foretold—The Divine Teacher Comforting His Disciples—A Future Home—Jesus, The Way—Their Future Guide—The Divine Teacher on the True Vine—The True Vine and Its Branches—The True Mark of a Disciple—The Friends of Jesus—The Divine Teacher Shown in His Great Intercessory Prayer—Jesus Prays for Himself—Jesus Prays for His Apostles—Jesus Prays for all Believers

Section Three: *The Holy Spirit's Testimony to the Christ—Expedient for Jesus to go Away—The Work of the Spirit—The Return of Jesus*

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this work is to show the mutual contributions of philosophy and theology. The history of philosophy and the history of theology have much in common, and if the theologian will study the history of philosophy it may be the means of saving him from many extremes and many errors. Philosophy has made important contributions to almost every department of theology. In the following departments it has certainly made important contributions: The Nature of God; The Nature of Man; God's Revelation to Man; Man's Duties to God; Man's Duties to Man; The Doctrine of a Future State.

Philosophy is the highest and truest science, for it specially pertains to effects, causes and principles; it has for its object the investigation of those fundamental principles upon which all knowledge and all being ultimately rest. Various definitions have been given by philosophers of the science of first principles. According to Ueberweg, one of the most full and complete writers on the history of philosophy, philosophy is the science of first principles; it is included under the general name of science, but differs from the remaining sciences in that it is not occupied with a limited province of things, but with the nature and laws of whatever actually exists. Lord Bacon confines philosophy to that part of human learning which specially pertains to the reason. Sir William Hamilton substantially accepts the Aristotelian view of philosophy, that it is equivalent to a knowledge of things in their origin and causes.

The word philosophy, which means a love of wisdom, is first found in the writings of Herodotus. It is attributed to Pythagoras, who selected it as a more modest title than sophist or wiseman. The word was appropriated and

first popularized by Socrates. He preferred it as more modest than the arrogant designation of the Sophists.

Strictly speaking, philosophy took its origin among the Greeks. It is true that the Orientals philosophized, but their philosophy is altogether blended with their mythology. There are also mystic cosmogonies of the Greeks, belonging to the Homeric age, that we do not include in philosophy. They belong to Greek mythology. The writings of Homer may be called the Bible of the Greeks. Although the Orientals had a high culture, philosophy could not have originated with them, because they held this culture too much in a passive state. We cannot look to the North for philosophy. Although the Northmen were eminent for strength and courage, philosophy could not have originated with them, for they were devoid of culture. But the Hellenes combined wonderful culture with extraordinary courage. There was no lack of activity on the part of the heroic Greeks.

The great philosophic center among the Greeks was the City of Athens. It was really the university of Greece. The greatest of all the monuments of Athens which have survived the waste of time is her philosophy. The Parthenon, of Minerva, and all the beautiful gems of Grecian architecture, are now in ruins. The works of Phidias, which adorned the temples of the gods and goddesses, and crowned the platform of the Acropolis, are now no more, except a few fragments which have been taken to other countries, and remain as relics of the departed greatness of the once proud city. While the fingers of time have destroyed the glorious work of art the philosophic thought of Athens, which culminated in the dialectics of Plato, still remains. The criticism of more than two thousand years has not improved much upon the method of Plato. As a great writer truly says, "Platonism is immortal, because the principles are immortal in the human intellect and heart."

Greek philosophy has received various classifications. In view of the prevailing spirit and tendency of the different schools, Cousin, one of the greatest of the more recent French philosophers, has classified them as the sensational, the idealistic, the skeptical and the mythical. Preceding

the Socratic school, we find in Greece, the Ionian, which tended to the sensational; the Italian, which tended to the idealistic; and the Sophistic, which tended to both the skeptical and the mythical. There is a tendency in the human mind to extremes; and it is only the greatest and best balanced minds that can avoid them. Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, the greatest of Greek philosophers, very largely avoided extremes. In another work, I have called them the Golden Mean Philosophers.

Roman philosophy was largely derived from the Greek, but the practical nature of the Roman mind gave a practical tendency to its philosophy. All the leading Greek schools were represented at Rome; but nearly all were largely comprehended in the Epicurean, Stoic and Eclectic schools. Lucretius was the most noted of Roman Epicureans, and he certainly produced one of the greatest poems in the Latin language. Stoicism appeared well suited to the Roman mind, and many of her greatest thinkers and even rulers were Stoics. But in Cicero and others Stoicism took an Eclectic tendency. This could not well be otherwise under the all-embracing empire of Rome.

Neo-Platonism has wielded a very powerful influence upon Theology. In fact, it was, in many respects, more of a Theology than a Philosophy. It was a complete triumph of the spiritual over the material; and it triumphed over all other philosophies. It entirely rejected materialism, and combined all other systems into a universal philosophy. Augustine declared that it was more like Christianity than any other system of philosophy. It has influenced Theology through German Philosophy; and it is not going too far to say that it has also affected English Philosophy. Hamilton and his school taught a number of things that had been emphasized by Plotinus. Even Herbert Spencer's doctrine of the Unknowable had been taught by Plotinus and his disciples. Neo-Platonism was an extreme, but it taught much truth. The Golden Mean Philosophy not only accepts the truth it taught; but it also accepts the truth it rejected, and combines all in harmony with true science and philosophy. All truth after all is a unit, whether found on Christian or on heathen land.

No man can understand the progress of human thought who rejects the study of Scholasticism. It concerned itself with philosophy and religion, which have been the great themes of all ages. In the contentions of the Scholastics over realism and nominalism we have substantially the modern problems of realism and idealism. The author believes that both positions were extremes and that the problems involved in their discussion can only be solved by the True Golden Mean Philosophy. Victor Cousin was right in the high estimate in which he held the Scholastics; and we may add that Scholasticism produced in Dante one of the greatest poets of all ages.

French Philosophy has had both a materialistic and an idealistic tendency. Both philosophies have had a very important influence upon Theology. Both systems were extremes, and the truth is found in the Golden Mean. In fact, nearly all error is partial truth pushed to an extreme. The Golden Mean Philosophy comprehends the truths contained in both extremes. German Philosophy has largely tended to idealism, and it has had a powerful influence upon a Mystic Theology. The Germans have been great investigators, and their philosophical conclusions have had wide-spread influence upon all modern philosophy. English Philosophy has had a practical tendency, and John Locke, the greatest of Englishmen, has probably influenced modern thought as much as any other philosopher. He was an earnest Christian, and his philosophy has had much influence upon modern Theology. The Scotch School fought a very important battle with the fearfully materialistic tendencies of the eighteenth century, and its success was such that it placed unanswerable arguments in the hands of Theologians with which to meet their materialistic and atheistic foes.

The influence of Philosophy upon the great Theologians of the Reformation is indeed an interesting study; and it fully illustrates the fact that a man's Theology is much the same as his philosophy. If you find a man a materialist in philosophy, he is certain to be a materialist in religion; and if you find him an idealist in philosophy, he is certain to be a mystic in religion. The influence of

Philosophy was very great upon the Theology of Martin Luther. His doctrine of trans-substantiation was a philosophical dogma; yet he held to it with such a tenacity that he would not, under any circumstances, give the hand of fellowship to Zwingli. The Stoicism of John Calvin caused him to imprison men who could not believe with Zeno. It must not be thought that Philosophy has always been the source of error in religion; on the other hand, it has made many contributions to the truth. John Wesley, Alexander Campbell and other great Reformers have been influenced by Philosophy as well as Luther and Calvin.

Philosophy has greatly contributed to the New Theology and the Higher Criticism. The sources of the New Theology are largely the Hegelian Philosophy and the Philosophy of Evolution. The New Theology contains much truth and it also contains much error. Christ, himself, taught development in religion—first the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear. The Patriarchal, the Jewish and the Christian Dispensations are a perfect illustration of this fact. The New Theology has greatly stimulated investigation as to the origin and nature of all the great religions of the world, and it is making the Science of Religion one of the most interesting studies. Philosophy is also the source of the Higher Criticism. The Higher Criticism has become a science and none but the ignorant write against it. One difficulty is the fact that some confound the Higher Criticism with Destructive Criticism. They are very different; the Higher Critic is usually a Christian and the Destructive Critic is usually an infidel.

Christology is the Ultimate Philosophy and Theology. The philosopher Hegel properly makes Christ the terminal point of all ancient history and the point of departure for all modern history. All the great problems with which philosophy has ever concerned itself can be solved from the standpoint of Christology. The existence of God, the creation of the universe, the relation of man to the divine government, the triumph of good over evil and the final destiny of man, can all be solved by Christology as by no other system of philosophy. Robert Browning was

right in his position that the acknowledgment of God in Christ, accepted by man's reason, solves for him all problems in this world and out of it. Christology is certainly the Untimate Theology. It really comprehends the truths contained in all others. It proves all things, and holds fast to the good. Christ is the center of all true Theology, and those who fully comprehend his nature and his mission will be fully able to settle all the great problems of this world and the world to come. In the Christ, thought and religion harmonize; and they become one, as the Father and Son are one, and this unity continues forever and ever. Christology holds to the truths contained in both Realism and Idealism, and strictly avoids their errors.

THOUGHT AND RELIGION

CHAPTER I

THE CONTRIBUTION OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY TO THEOLOGY

The Pre-Socratic Philosophy

The Ionian school was realistic in its tendency, and the Italian school was extremely idealistic. Thales, who was born at Miletus, B. C., 636, was the founder of the Ionian school. He was doubtless influenced by the theology of Egypt in his fundamental doctrine in reference to the origin of things. The Egyptians believed that the river Nile was the source of all life, and it was consequently one of their principal objects of worship. It is a characteristic of all philosophical minds to reduce all diversities to one fundamental principle. In studying the constitution of the earth he found moisture everywhere. His position also appeared to have the support of Greek Theology. Homer and Hesiod represented Oceanus and Thetis as the parents of all the gods that had any relation to nature. Dr. Draper thus speaks of the position of Anaximenes, who was a disciple of Thales, and held that air was the fundamental substance: "And since it is seen from the results of breathing that the air is the life giving principle to man, nay, even is actually his soul, it would appear to be a just inference that the infinite air is God and that the gods and goddesses have sprung from it."

Thales taught that the soul is incorporeal, self-active, and intelligent. Aristotle in *De Anima* says, "If we may rely on the notices of Thales, he too would seem to have conceived the soul as a moving principle." This was an important contribution to Theology. The following is a

statement of Thales according to Diogenes Laertius, "God is the most ancient of all things, for he had no birth; the world is the most beautiful of all things, for it is the workmanship of God." Cicero in *De Natura Deorum* says, "Thales said that water was the first principle of all things, but God was that mind which formed all things out of water." The Ionian school not only made a contribution to Theism, but its philosophers largely taught God's immanence in nature.

Pythagoras of Samos, born B. C., 605, was the founder of the Italian school. He travelled extensively in Egypt and was greatly influenced by the Theology of that country. Like Moses he was educated in all the learning of the Egyptians. The fundamental ideas of his philosophy was that beneath the fleeting forms and successive changes of the universe there is some permanent principle of unity. The Ionian school sought this principle in the physical elements, and the Italian school sought it in the relation of things. Pythagoras taught that the soul was a self moving number or Monad, the copy of that Infinite Monad which unfolds from its own essence all the relations of the universe. He taught that the soul has three elements, Reason, Intelligence, and Passion. The last two, man has in common with the brute, but the first is his grand and peculiar characteristic.

Xenophanes, one of the greatest philosophers of this school plainly taught Theism. He said: "There is one God, of all beings, divine and human the greatest." He taught that God has no parts, no organs, as men have, being "All sight, all ear, all intelligence, wholly exempt from toil. He sways all things by thought and will." The following language from the *Principia* of Newton will show how much the great English Natural Philosopher was dependant upon Xenophanes: "The Supreme God exists necessarily, and by the same necessity he exists always and everywhere. Whence, also, he is all similar, all eye, all ear, all brain, all arm, all power to perceive, to understand, and to act, but in a manner not at all human, not at all corporeal; in a manner utterly unknown to us. As a blind man has no idea of colors, so we have no idea of the manner by which the all wise God perceives and

understands all things. He is utterly void of all body and bodily figure, and can therefore neither be seen, nor heard, nor touched, nor ought to be worshipped under the representation of any corporeal thing. We have ideas of his attributes, but what the real substance of anything is we know not."

Socrates

At the completion of the first epoch of philosophy when the thinkers of Greece, in despair, went into skepticism, Socrates appeared upon the stage. He was born near Athens, 469 B. C., and was the son of Sophroniscus, a sculptor. He followed for a time the occupation of his father, and tradition claims that he produced some interesting works. His personal appearance was decidedly against him. It is said that he had a flat nose, thick lips, prominent eyes, and a bald head. He had, however, a powerful constitution, and trained himself to great endurance. While a soldier he won the admiration of all; for there were none more brave and self-sacrificing than was he. He loved his country, and when it became necessary he was ready to fight for it.

It is strange that the Athenians should condemn to death the man who had been their greatest friend. Such, however, has been the history of the world. The nations have not usually appreciated their greatest benefactors. There is no business more thankless than that of a critic. Men do not usually like to be told their faults, especially when they do not intend to forsake them. Socrates was pre-eminently a critic. There was not an evil in Athens about which he did not have something to say. As the Jews became tired of the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, so the Athenians became tired of their preacher of righteousness. They were determined to silence him in some way, and they thought the certain way was to put him to death.

Socrates produced an era in philosophy. He saw the evil tendencies in the preceding schools, and was anxious to make his system more practical. He thought that men

and society were the proper objects of study. Like Dr. Johnson, he was not an admirer of external nature, and thought that all wheat fields looked alike. He preferred to give his time to the study of man. He created ethical science, and his teachings in that department have seemed marvelous even to the greatest thinkers of modern times.

Socrates had invincible faith in truth; he made her the mistress of his soul, and patiently toiled after perfect communion with her. He felt as did Jesus, that truth alone would give freedom. On one occasion, when he came in contact with the public authorities, his language was almost identical with that used by Peter and John when forbidden to preach by the Sanhedrim: "Whether it be right in the sight of the gods to hearken unto you rather than to the gods, judge ye; but as for me, I have sworn to obey the laws, and I can not forswear myself." This great Greek philosopher felt that he had a divine mission, and that nothing should get in the way of it. The faithful monitor, which he called the Daimon, was evidently the voice of conscience. He felt that it was a divine voice, and always heeded its warning. It would be well for the world if all men would listen to the words of caution which that monitor that God has placed in the bosom of each is constantly sending forth.

This great Greek moralist was eminently a religious man. He taught that we can only know God in his works, thus recognizing the doctrine of divine providence. His religion was strictly humanitarian, as he declared the well-being of man to be the end of the universe. He loved to study final causes, and gave to them more attention than to efficient causes. While he did not deny inferior deities, he looked upon them very much as we look upon angels—as infinitely below the Supreme Being. I believe that Socrates was a monotheist, but he did not entirely ignore the polytheism of his day.

The Christian fathers have almost universally taught that the Socratic philosophy was a preparation for Christianity. Socrates taught that religious duties are three: reverence, gratitude, and obedience. Where these things were taught the people could not otherwise than be better prepared for Christianity. The tendency of the Socratic

philosophy was to free the mind from polytheistic notions, and bring before it prominently the theistic idea. While Socrates did not definitely reject polytheism, the tendency of his philosophy was to undermine it. He recognized beyond its gods the Supreme Being, and when the people learned to worship Him, they would gradually give up the worship of inferior deities. While others among the Greeks, even before Socrates, believed in one Supreme Being, the tendency of the Socratic philosophy was to spiritualize the theistic conception. He not only taught that there is one God, but that God is spirit. Obedience to God, who is spirit, he also taught, and this purified the moral sense, and prepared the Greeks for something better. The Socratic philosophy has certainly made important contributions to Theology.

The Socratic philosophy very definitely taught a future life, which was in itself an important preparation for Christianity. Just before his death the great philosopher conversed with his friends on the subject of a future state. Crito asked him how he wanted to be buried. The philosopher told him any way he liked, if he could only get hold of him. He then turned to his friends and said: "I cannot persuade this good Crito that I who am talking to him, and marshaling the heads of my arguments, am the veritable Socrates; but he persists in thinking that Socrates is this body which he will see by and by stretched out on the floor, and he asks how he is to bury me." Socrates insisted that after death he would leave them and go to the land of the blest. The fact cannot be questioned that man has an instinctive anticipation of a future state; and Socrates studied the inward man so thoroughly that he was satisfied on that point. The resignation of Socrates at the hour of death is an interesting subject for reflection for even those who live in the light of a high Christian civilization. For a fuller discussion of this subject, see Chapter on "The Socratic Philosophy and Christianity," in the author's "Struggles and Triumphs of the Truth."

Plato

Plato, in many respects, the greatest of Greek philosophers was born in the city of Athens, about 429 B. C., and died about 348 B. C. He was born the very year of the death of Pericles, the second year of the Peloponnesian War, which was so fatal to the fortunes of the Athenians. His writings are all the middle Attic, the purest and richest dialect of the most perfect and classic language among all the members in the great Indo-European family of languages. When Plato first came to Socrates he was skeptical for the philosophy of his age was not sufficient to satisfy such a gigantic mind. In the school of Socrates he found breathing room, and got rid of his doubts by seeking more truth. Socrates directed his attention to the study of Ethics, and in this department he became the most distinguished philosopher in the world. Much of the reputation of Socrates was due to Plato; for he placed his own greater developed philosophical system in the mouth of his master. Socrates is made the center of his dialogues, and the leader of all his discourses.

Plato's religious ideas are largely comprehended in the department of physics. In favor of the immortality of the soul, Plato in his *Phaedo* presents the following arguments: (1) from the principle that contraries spring from contraries, death from life, and consequently life from death; (2) from the soul's independence of the body; (3) from its nature, which renders it incapable of dissolution; (4) from its superiority to the body; (5) God does not will the destruction of that which he has put together in such a beautiful manner, and endowed with such high aspirations. All will agree with Addison that Plato reasoned well; and even modern philosophers can present no stronger arguments in favor of the immortality of the soul than are presented in the *Phaedo* of Plato.

Plato rose above the polytheism of his age to a knowledge of the Supreme Being. The following are his arguments to prove the existence of God: (1) Beneath the changeable there is an unchangeable Being, who is the nurse and protector of the universe. (2) Beneath the phenomena

of mind there is a permanent mind, who is the great rational Being, antedating and creating the universe. (3) Beneath all finite existence there is an Infinite existence, the first principle of all principles, the Ruler and Lawgiver of the universe. Plato taught the absolute perfection of the Infinite Being; that he is the fountain of all law and justice, the beginning and end of all things. The divine beauty is the formal cause, the divine power the efficient cause, and the divine goodness the final cause of all existences.

Plato presented to the world a very high system of Ethics. He taught that justice and equity are founded in the very nature of God, hence eternal. The true, the beautiful and the good were never created, but are inherent in the very nature of things. The object of revelation is to make known to man the true, the beautiful and the good. Right existed from eternity, and philosophy and religion have for their object the influence of man in conformity to the right. Plato taught that no man willingly does evil; that is, that no man does evil for evil's sake. He is very careful to guard this point against misunderstanding. While a man may choose evil voluntarily as a means, he does not choose it as an end. How, then, do men become evil? Plato answers that man is restless, and seeks change; he indulges his desires and passions to excess. He gets tired of the good, and tries the bad. Plato taught that man has the power of changing his moral character. He was a believer in the freedom of the will. Man was made in the image of God, and as God is a free moral agent, man must of necessity also be a free moral agent. Man has the ability to choose the right or the wrong.

Plato gives the following reasons why men choose the wrong: (1) The soul is connected with the sensible world by means of a body, and is thus influenced to sin. (2) The passions prevail over the soul and disorder it. (3) Society is corrupted by bad forms of civil government, and bad education effects the ruin of the soul. Thus the soul is changed and fallen from what it was when it came from the hands of its Creator. The object of life is to purify

it, and prepare it for a restoration to its original sinlessness.

The Platonic philosophy has certainly made very important contributions to Theology. Emerson certainly goes to a great extreme, when he says that Christianity is found in the *Phaedo* of Plato; but it is evident that the Platonic philosophy has had a very great influence upon Christianity. It did much towards perfecting the Greek language, which was an important preparation for Christianity. In Alexandria, the Old Testament was translated into Greek; then the writings of Plato were diligently studied, and Philo endeavored to unite the Platonic philosophy with Judaism. From this union there arose a class of Jews who, when converted to Christianity, were very beneficial in allaying the prejudice of Jewish Christians against the Gentiles. Stephen, the first martyr, belonged to this class.

Aristotle

In the history of Greek philosophy, Socrates was the man of action, Plato, the man of literature, and Aristotle, the man of science. They were, of course, all great philosophers, but in the progress of culture they specially represented the phases mentioned. Socrates went about as a preacher of righteousness; Plato handled language so artistically as to become a general favorite; but Aristotle came with the dissecting knife in his hand, and addressed himself to those who were willing to make special dissections for the sake of knowledge. He was pre-eminently a man of science, and has left us the means of presenting our ordinary thoughts. When we say that a man is in an unfortunate predicament, we are using the nomenclature of Aristotle. Had it not been for this great Greek thinker, modern science would be compelled to express many of its thoughts differently.

Aristotle, the greatest of the world's philosophers and scientists, was born in Stagira, a Greek colony of Macedonia, in 384 B. C., and died at Chalcis, in 322 B. C. The name of his birthplace always clung to him in the title by which he was called—the Stagirite philosopher. The

father of this great philosopher was a physician at the court of the Macedonian king. This is thought to have exercised great influence over the studies of his illustrious son. The boy's thirst for knowledge was such that at an early age he repaired to the city of Athens, and became a pupil of the distinguished Plato. His progress was such that Plato called him the intellect of his school. He remained a student of this school for twenty years, and might have remained longer had it not been for the death of its master. This ought to be a lesson for those who claim to acquire a university education in three or four years. While Aristotle greatly loved his world-renowned teacher, his mental characteristics greatly differed from those of Plato. Plato was poetic and ideal; Aristotle was prosaic and systematic; Plato was intuitive and synthetical Aristotle was logical and analytical. Such are some of the mental characteristics of the two men, and it is natural to suppose that Aristotle would develop a new system, and give a different direction to philosophic thought.

In the Aristotelian organon, we have exactly the reverse of the Platonic. Plato by logical analysis drew from the depth of consciousness certain fundamental ideas inherent in the mind. These he takes as starting points from which to pass beyond the sensible world to God himself. After having attained to universal and necessary ideas by abstraction, he descends to the sensible world, and from these ideas he constructs the intellectual theory of the universe. Aristotle reverses the process; he commences with sensation, and proceeds by induction from the known to the unknown. According to Aristotle, the repetition of sensations produces recollection, recollection produces experience, and experience produces science. It is only by means of experience that men can be scientists and artists. While experience is the knowledge of individual things, art is the knowledge of universals. Aristotle taught that there are principles in the mind not derived from experience, and his teachings on the subject are much more philosophic and truthful than the one-sided views of many modern utilitarians.

The reasoning of Aristotle on the question of causation is perfectly marvelous, and he has certainly made very important contributions to modern theology. He re-

duced his material, formal, efficient, and final causes to matter and form. Matter at first has potential existence, and is without form. It can only be brought into shape by the Eternal Substance, who alone has pure form. The Eternal Substance was with Aristotle God himself; so the universe could not have had its present form without the omnipotent power of God. Aristotle perfectly understood that matter could not move itself, and placed back of it an eternal actuality. As matter could not move itself, the actuality which moved it was of course, not matter, and therefore spirit. Modern theology is very largely founded upon the ontological, cosmological, and moral proofs given by Aristotle of the existence of one true God.

It has been said, to the praise of Aristotle, that his system of ethics contains nothing that a Christian can afford to dispense with, no precept of life which is not an element of Christian character, and that its teachings fail only in elevating the heart and the mind to objects of divine revelation. Our great author properly emphasizes the influence of habit upon life, and it is certain that habit has a good deal to do with religion. If certain evil habits are acquired, it is very difficult to make a man religious. What is true happiness for man? Aristotle would make it the full satisfaction of the highest elements of his nature. There has been a good deal of discussion about the Golden Mean taught by Aristotle. It must be remembered that Aristotle's view was thoroughly Greek, and based on the analogy of art. When a Greek would speak of right or wrong, he would speak of it as beautiful or ugly. The object of the Greek was to avoid the too much or the too little, and in this way to attain to perfection. Temperance was the mean between greediness and indifference, and liberality was the mean between prodigality and stinginess. While the Aristotelian system of ethics was not perfect, it was certainly an important preparation for that system which is perfect. Christianity presents the perfect ideals, which would make this world a paradise. It appears to me that the great mistake of many modern utilitarians is the fact that they ignore the past. Hume, Bentham, and James Mill persistently

ignore the great truths handed down for the use of all ages by the master minds of antiquity. Many of the disciples of Bentham claim that his discovery of the principle of utility was as great an era in moral science as was the discovery of the principles of gravitation in physical science. This is a great mistake; for the word utility is not distinctive to this school. It had been appropriated by others more than a thousand years before the days of Bentham. While the Utilitarian school holds to much truth, one wing of it has gone into materialism. The truth is the Golden Mean between the Utilitarian and Intuitional, and they have both made important contributions. For a further discussion of this subject, see the author's *Cultura*.

CHAPTER II

THE CONTRIBUTION OF ROMAN PHILOSOPHY TO THEOLOGY

SECTION ONE

The Philosophy of the Stoics in Rome

The Philosophy of Rome was borrowed from the Greeks, but the Roman mind gave it a practical turn. The Philosophy of the Stoics acquired a widespread influence over the Roman Empire. The word Stoic is from the Greek *stoa*, which means a porch. It has reference to the place where Zeno, the founder of the school gave instruction. About 310 B. C., the school was opened, and attracted the attention of some of the greatest men of the day. The king of Macedon attended Zeno's lectures, and Ptolemy Philadelphus of Egypt, had his exact words taken down. He was at the head of the Stoic school for half a century, and was much respected for the boldness of his language and austerity of his life. Zeno attained to the advanced age of ninety-eight, and at his death, was honored by the Athenians with a golden chaplet and a public tomb in the Ceramicus.

The Stoics were among the greatest philosophers at Athens in the days of Paul. In fact, they wielded a much more moral influence than did the Epicureans. At the conclusion of Paul's celebrated discourse on Mar's hill, the Epicureans mocked, but the Stoics went away saying indifferently: "We will hear you again concerning this matter." They were too polite and too moral to mock as did the Epicureans.

One of the greatest faults in the Stoical philosophy is its influence in reference to indifference. The Stoic was indifferent in reference to both the pleasures and sorrows

of life. His doctrine was directly antagonistic to the teaching of the Gospel on that subject, and also the teaching of true science. Science, as well as the Bible, teaches us to rejoice with those that rejoice, and weep with those that weep.

The spirit of true science is in harmony with the Bible in its condemnation of indifferentism. How can the man who thinks be indifferent to the great problems of life?

The Pantheistic tendency of the Stoic philosophy had a great influence over the Roman mind. While some of them doubtless believed in a personal existence in the future, the majority believed in the final absorption of the individual into the great soul of the universe. Dr. Draper, of New York, author of *Intellectual Development in Europe*, who was himself a pantheist, told me that he fully believed in the conscious existence of the individual in a future state. The greatest philosophers of the past have favored the doctrine of a future existence for man. It remained, however, for the Gospel to fully reveal the fact that there is a life and immortality beyond the grave. While philosophers endeavored to make provisions for the spirit, they could not tell what would become of the body. Paul by the spirit of God, clearly teaches that the body and soul, as well as the spirit, are to be preserved blameless, until the coming of Christ. It is evident that theology has made important contributions to philosophy as well as philosophy to theology.

As the moral influence of the Stoics is not generally understood, I wish to call attention to it, so that, with all their faults, we may be able to do them justice. During the first Christian century, the Roman Empire was cursed by tyranny and corruption. Then reigned Tiberius, Caligula, Nero and Domitian. At the death of the latter, A. D., 96, Gibbon says, began the history of the world, during which the human race was most happy. The statement is too broad, yet it contains much truth. Eighty-four years until 180, A. D., reigned Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, and the two Antonines, all of whom, according to Gibbon, delighted in liberty. Archbishop Trench, in his lectures on Plutarch, speaks in high terms of this period. This period may be called the reign of the

Stoics. The five emperors mentioned were all students of Stoicism. This philosophy was doubtless the cause of the moral character of their reigns. No one who properly studies Stoicism can question its moral influence upon its advocates.

With Marcus Aurelius Antoninus closed the reign of the Stoics. He is pronounced by historians as one of the greatest and most pious of Roman emperors. Matthew Arnold pronounces him the most beautiful figure in history. Merrivale says, that he was the noblest soul that ever lived. During the reign of the Stoics, the position of woman was elevated. They taught no esoteric views, for women and even slaves were admitted to the lectures. The death of Marcus Aurelius consummated the glory of stoicism. It has something of the same effect that the death of Cromwell had upon Puritanism. The emperor did not fear death, for he said, "Come quickly, O death! lest I, too, forget myself." He said to his friends, "Why do you weep for me, and not rather think of the pestilence and common death?"

Seneca, the great Roman moralist, was a Stoic. He was born at Cordova, Spain, a few years before the Christian era, and died in Rome, A. D., 65. He studied rhetoric and philosophy in Rome; then travelled in Egypt and Greece. He was afterwards the tutor of Nero, but did not succeed in impressing his philosophical maxims upon the mind of his obdurate pupil. He was finally executed by the order of the infamous Nero. Seneca has been called an Atheist, but his writings clearly show that he was a Deist. Deism is not necessarily in conflict with the higher pantheism; for the poet Tennyson was both a deist and higher pantheist. Tradition states that he was favorable to Christianity; that he was acquainted with the Apostle Paul, and wrote several letters to the apostle.

Cicero, the celebrated orator, was a Stoic. In his Tusculan Disputations and other works he has presented to the world some beautiful thoughts on philosophical subjects. He maintained that the Stoics were largely the followers of Aristotle, and opposed to Plato and the doctrine of innate ideas. That he was correct in this, is

shown from the fact that Plutarch always treated the Stoics as the opponents of his master, Plato.

Sayings of the Stoics

1. In reference to self-control.

Seneca presents the following beautiful thoughts:

“There is nothing grand that is not also calm. Wisdom shows her strength by her peace amid troubles, like an army encamped in safety in a hostile land. In the upper air there is neither cloud nor storm, and so in the lofty soul there is peace. Peace of mind comes by meditating diligently over wise maxims, by doing our duty, and by setting our hearts on what is noble. A very little can satisfy our necessities, but nothing our desires. He has reached the height of wisdom, who knows what to rejoice in, and does not place his happiness in another’s power. Whom am I to conquer? Not the Persians, nor the distant Medes, not the warlike tribes who dwell beyond Dacia, but avarice, ambition and fear of death, which subdue the conquerors of nations. The wise man’s joy is woven so well as not to be broken by any accident.

The poor man much, the miser all things need,
Unkind to all, but worse for him his deeds;
That mortal needs the least who least desires;
He has his wish who, as he needs, aspires.

“The wise man will not punish offenders for his own revenge, but for their amendment. He will treat them as the doctor does his patients; and what physician is angry with a maniac? That man is never safe who can be moved by injury or abuse.

Never does the suspicious man lack evidence. The best cure for anger is delay. Sin is never to be overcome by sin.

Most persons seek in the tavern that pleasure which is to be found in labor. That pleasure which is worthy of a man consists in not overloading the body, nor exciting those passions whose rest is our safety. The pleasures which the body gives are fleeting, soon regretted, and

likely to become painful, unless restrained strictly. True pleasure can never cease, nor be turned into pain."

2. In reference to religion, we quote from the great Seneca, one of the most eminent of the Stoics:

"To live among men as if God saw you. So speak to God as if men heard you. Religion worships; superstition blasphemes. There is no pure soul in which God is not. Every man has power to make himself happy. So grand and noble is the mind of man, that it accepts no limits, except those which belong also to God. God has given us power to bear everything without being degraded or crushed. Better die than live ill. What should we desire earnestly? Only this: Just thoughts, philanthropic actions, words which never deceive, and readiness to accept what happens as a necessary part of the whole. Human life consists of kindness and harmony, and is held together for mutual help, not by terror, but by love.

"A kindness should be returned in the same spirit in which it was bestowed. He who gives ought to forget it immediately; but he who receives, never. The chief cause of ingratitude is too high an opinion of ourselves. Gratitude returns intention for intention, as well as act for act."

There are scientific discoveries which many attribute to a later date that were known to the Stoics. They believed in the rotundity of the earth, and the force of gravitation. An early Stoic says, "It is probable, that all bodies have their first motion, according to nature, towards the center of the world." Marcus Aurelius uses language very similar. Plutarch ridicules the Stoics for their belief in gravitation and the spherical form of the earth, and accused them of a position which taught that men stuck to the earth like wood-worms or lizards, with their heads downward. It is evident that there was some knowledge of gravitation even before the days of the great Newton.

The fatalistic doctrine of the Stoics has certainly had an influence upon modern Theology. When we come to discuss the source of John Calvin's Theology, we will find that Stoicism had its influence upon this celebrated reformer. In fact, Calvinism is in some particulars a reproduction of the doctrines of the Stoics.

SECTION TWO

Epicureanism in Rome

Epicurus was born B. C., 342, and died 270 B. C. He purchased a garden in the city of Athens, and began teaching philosophy at the age of 36. Although he wrote many books, none have been preserved. The writings of Lucretius, the great Roman poet, have thrown more light on the philosophy of Epicurus than have the writings of any other author. In fact, Lucretius was the greatest of all the disciples of Epicurus, and one of the greatest of Roman poets. The psychology of Epicurus was largely a product of the Ionian school, which taught that sensation is the source of all knowledge and the standard of all truth. His physical system was derived from Democritus; for with both, all things were from atoms. With Aristotle, he agreed that happiness was the end of practical life, if absolute good be not the end. According to Epicurus, the grand object of philosophy is the attainment of a happy life. He was a thorough Utilitarian, and modern Utilitarianism is doubtless indebted to him. Truth with Epicurus was merely a relative thing, and its pursuit for its own sake he considered useless.

The following are some of the proofs given by Epicurus to show that pleasure is the chief thing:

(1) All animals from birth are delighted with pleasure and offended with pain. (2) All men like pleasure and dislike pain. (3) Men deliberately and animals instinctively choose pleasure. Epicurus made two divisions of pleasure; first those of excitement; second those of tranquility. He taught that there are pleasures we should avoid in order to gain greater pleasures. Epicurus did not dispense with virtue; but used it as a means to secure happiness. The difference between the common man and the philosopher, he taught, was the fact that the common man sought the things that give immediate pleasure, while the philosopher sought the things that give pleasure for a life time.

Epicureanism was pure materialism, and modern

materialists use almost precisely the arguments employed by Epicurus and Lucretius. Please observe the arguments used by them to prove the materiality of the soul, and see if they are not much the same as those employed by modern materialistic writers. (1) The action and reaction of the soul and body upon each other prove them to be of similar substances. (2) The mind is produced with and grows along with the body. (3) The mind is diseased along with the body and needs medicines. (4) Some faculties are impaired before others. According to Epicurus and Lucretius, the soul is divided and composed of different atoms; these they claim are dissolved with the body, and man has no conscious existence after death. The doctrine of an eternal sleep is not, then, one of modern invention.

Epicurus acknowledges the insufficiency of matter to explain sensation and thought, and consequently brings in a nameless substance. May not that hidden substance be an immaterial principle? So far as Epicurus knew it had as well be called spirit as matter. May not the union of spirit and matter be the cause of sensation and thought? for where all is matter there is no cognition. There is an invisible and conscious agent connected with man that guides the body; it thinks, it feels, it acts, and there is as much reality in its phenomena as there is in the properties of matter. That agent we call spirit, and as soon as it leaves the body there is no longer motion in the body.

Epicurus believed in the existence of the gods; but they were idle gods and had nothing to do in the affairs of man. The Epicureans have had their followers in theology. The Jewish sect of the Sadducees was Epicurean. The modern soul-sleeper is really a disciple of Epicurus and Lucretius. He is a materialist and believes that the spirit will die with the body; but he believes that God will raise them to life. Even Archbishop Whately was a soul-sleeper, and in this particular, at least, he was a disciple of Epicurus and Lucretius.

SECTION THREE

Eclecticism in Rome

Roman Philosophy specially tended to Eclecticism. While Cicero has been classed among the Stoics, he was really one of the greatest of the Eclectics, and Stoicism itself tended to Eclecticism in Rome. Zeller thus speaks: "From the preceding chapters it will be seen how, in the first century before Christ, the three scientifically most important schools of philosophy had coincided in a more or less strongly developed eclecticism. This mode of thought must have commended itself the more readily to those who, from the outset, had concerned themselves rather with the practically applicable fruits of philosophic studies rather than with strict science. Such was the case with Cicero. Cicero's youth falls in a period in which not only the influence of Greek philosophy on Roman culture, but also the approximation and partial blending of the philosophic schools had already begun to develop themselves strongly. He himself had become acquainted with the various systems, partly from the writings of their founders and representatives and partly from his teachers. In his early youth, the Epicurean doctrine had commended itself to him through the teaching of Phaedrus; after this Philo of Larissa introduced him to the new Academy, among whose adherents he persistently reckoned himself; at the same time he enjoyed the instruction of the Stoic Diodotus who also remained at a later period in close proximity to him; before the commencement of his public career he visited Greece, attended the instructions of his old teacher Phaedrus, but with special eagerness those of Antiochus, the chief founder of Academic eclecticism, and he entered into a connection with Posidonius, which continued till the death of that philosopher. Also in philosophical literature he had taken such a wide survey that we cannot withhold from him the praise of wide reading, though at the same time his knowledge of that literature is neither independent nor thorough enough to warrant his being called a man of

great erudition. He, himself, based his fame not so much on his own inquiries into philosophy as on the art with which he had clothed Greek philosophy in Roman dress, and made it accessible to his countrymen.

As we select Cicero as the best representative of Roman Eclecticism, it is proper to give here the following language of A. W. Benn, in his *Greek Philosophers*: "The greatest of Roman orators and writers was also the first Roman that held opinions of his own in philosophy. How much original thought is contained in his voluminous contributions to the literature of the subject is more than we can determine, the Greek authorities on which he drew being known almost exclusively through the reference contained in his disquisitions. But, judging from the evidence before us, carefully as it has been sifted by German scholars, we should be disposed to assign him foremost rank among the thinkers of an age not distinguished either for fertility or depth of thought. It seems clear that he gave a new basis to the eclectic tendencies of his contemporaries, and that this basis was subsequently accepted by other philosophers whose speculative capacity has never been questioned."

Cicero has made some very important contributions to Theology, and his influence upon Christian thought has been great. The religious sentiment seems to have been more highly developed in him than in any other thinker of his age. He has even been compared to Socrates. Like the great Greek philosopher, he viewed God under the threefold aspect of a Creator, a Providence, and an Informing Spirit. He also claimed that the soul of man was like God, and consequently that God had man for his peculiar care. Cicero taught the doctrine of innate knowledge, and that man has an intuition of the existence of God. While in these things he doubtless went too far; still his teachings have had a great influence upon modern theology. Cicero says, "Belief in the Deity rests upon the same basis: by virtue of the human spirit's affinity with God, the consciousness of God is immediately given with self-consciousness: man has only to remember his own origin in order to be led to his Creator. Nature, therefore, her-

self instructs us concerning the existence of God, and the strongest argument of this truth is its universal recognition; for that in which all agree without previous persuasion, must always be regarded as an utterance of nature. The immortality of the soul must likewise belong to these innate truths, of which we are convinced through universal consent." In the same way Cicero seemed to presuppose the freedom of the will. In fact, he founded his philosophy and morality on direct consciousness.

Cicero intimately connects his anthropology with his theology. It is only necessary for us to fully understand our origin, in order to form a proper conception of the dignity of human nature. He fully believed in the supernatural origin of the soul, and the material origin of the body. He believed the soul to be an immaterial substance, and that it would return to God at death. His arguments in favor of the immortality of the soul are similar to those of Plato, and they are a very important contribution to theology.

Cicero made ethics very prominent in his philosophy. His ethical system is directly opposed to the Epicurean, and it is largely a combination of the Stoic, the Academic, and the Peripatetic. It clearly shows the eclectic tendency of Cicero's mind. It shows confidence in God and in the divine mission of man, and is worthy of careful study by all students of ethics. It has important suggestions for even those who are guided by our higher Christian ethics.

The Eclectics of Rome held to the truths of both Realism and Idealism, and had considerable success in combining them into one system. A careful study of Roman philosophy is very essential to the student of both philosophy and theology. In this connection, I commend to the reader the following language of John Caird, in his *Philosophy of Religion*: "There is involved in man's spiritual nature a consciousness which goes beyond his consciousness of himself and of things without—an absolute self-consciousness which is the unity of all thought and being. It is the very essence of man as a spiritual, self-conscious being to transcend the finite, to rise above the world of inner and outer experience, seeing that

neither would have any meaning or reality if they did not rest on and imply a consciousness deeper than the consciousness of the individual self, deeper than the consciousness of Nature, a universal Mind or Intelligence which is the prius and the unity of both. It is this capacity of transcending the finite, this affinity to that which is universal and Infinite, which constitutes the latent grandeur of man's nature and has been the secret impulse of all that is great and noble in the individual life and history of the race. It is this relation to the Infinite which, above all, gives meaning to the outward history of religion. Man's spiritual nature is the form of an infinite content, and morality and religion are the practical, as philosophy is the speculative effort to realize it. When we contemplate the religious experience of man as he endeavors to make himself one with that Infinite life which his spiritual nature presupposes, to renounce himself and all finite ends, and to become the organ of the Infinite Mind,—or, in briefer terms, when we consider religion as the self-surrender of the human spirit to the Divine,—we have the key to the religious experience of mankind."

CHAPTER III

THE CONTRIBUTION OF NEOPLATONISM TO BOTH PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

The Encyclopaedia Britannica says, "The political history of the ancient world closes with the formation, under Diocletian and Constantine, of a universal state bearing the cast of Oriental as well as Greco-Roman civilization. The history of ancient philosophy ends in a like manner with a universal philosophy, which appropriated elements of almost all the earlier systems, and worked up the results of eastern and western culture. And, just as the Byzantine Roman empire was the supreme effort of the old world and the outcome of its exhaustion, so Neoplatonism is in one aspect the consummation, in another, the collapse of ancient philosophy. Never before in Greek or Roman speculation had the consciousness of man's dignity and superiority to nature found such adequate expression; and never before had real science and pure knowledge been so under-valued and despised by the leaders of culture as they were by the Neoplatonists. Judged from the standpoint of pure science, or the empirical investigation of the universe, philosophy passed its meridian in Plato and Aristotle, declined in the post-Aristotelian systems, and set in the darkness of Neoplatonism. But, from the religious and moral point of view, it may be affirmed that the ethical mood which Neoplatonism endeavored to create and maintain is the highest and purest ever reached by antiquity. That this attainment should have been made at the expense of science was inevitable. On the level of the polytheistic nature—religious physical science must either subjugate and destroy religion, or be subjugated and destroyed by it. Religion and morality are, however, found to be the stronger forces; and philosophy, standing

midway between these and physical science, may waver for a little, but ultimately yields to the greater power. The conflict with empirical knowledge is rendered inevitable by the fact that within the sphere of nature—religion the ethical is itself, without any misgiving conceived as a higher order of the natural. The higher physics—for as such we must here regard religious ethics—must dislodge the lower, in order to maintain its own ground. Philosophy must cease to exist as science, in order that man's assertion to the supernatural value of his person as his life may receive full recognition."

Neoplatonism has a right to the name of Plato, because it goes back to him for its metaphysics, and directly opposes the metaphysics of the Stoics. It must nevertheless be admitted that the Neoplatonic conception of the action of the Deity upon the world was borrowed from the pantheistic philosophy of the Stoics. With the exception of Epicureanism, which Neoplatonism regarded as its deadly enemy, this new philosophy borrowed from all preceding systems. Zeller truly says, "In Plato and Aristotle, the distinction of the sensible from the intelligible is the strongest affirmation of the validity of the thinking process. It is one sense perception and the existence perceived by the senses, whose relative unreality is pre-supposed; of a higher region of spiritual life, lying beyond the notion and beyond thought, there is no hint. In Neoplatonism, on the contrary, it is precisely this supra-rational which is held to be the final goal of all effort and the ultimate ground of all being. Rational cognition is only an intermediate stage between sense perception and super-rational intuition; the forms of the intellect are not the highest and ultimate reality, but only the channels through which the activity of the formless primeval being flows into the world. This theory, therefore, proceeds, not merely on the denial of the reality of sensible existence and sensible presentations, but upon absolute doubt—a straining after something beyond the sum of total reality. The highest intelligible is not that which constitutes the actual contents of reason, but simply what man postulates and reaches after as the unknowable ground of his thought." Neoplatonism is thus presented

in a nutshell; it did not consider rational cognition, nor sense perception as a sufficient basis for religious ethics. It consequently broke away from rationalistic ethics and utilitarian morality. In Neoplatonism it is evident that nothing except a revelation from above, a divine revelation, can meet the religious demands of man's nature. It taught that through all history God had breathed and that everywhere we find traces of revelation. In Neoplatonism, therefore, religion has contributed to philosophy and philosophy to religion. While it made many very great mistakes, it taught both an absolute religion and an absolute philosophy.

The founder of Neoplatonism, if indeed it had a personal founder, was Ammonius Saccas, who was said to have been a Christian by birth, and to have relapsed into paganism. As he left no written works, his teachings can only be learned from his disciples. He lectured to his pupils on Plato, and to his own satisfaction reconciled Plato and Aristotle. The most distinguished of his disciples were Origen and Plotinus.

It is claimed that in 210, A. D., Origen declared himself a disciple of Ammonius Saccas, the founder of Neoplatonism. At Alexandria, he so enlarged the sphere of his teaching as to make all known philosophy a preparation for the scientific study of Christian theology. He was assisted in his work by Ambrose, who purchased manuscripts and provided a number of amanuenses. He published great commentaries on the Bible and employed the methods of the Neoplatonists. This mixture of Christian principles with philosophy gave his opponents the wanted opportunity to make severe attacks upon him. It is also evident that through him Neoplatonism wielded a powerful influence upon Christian philosophy.

Erdmann, in his *History of Philosophy*, thus speaks of Origen: "The fact that Origen, in addition to the historical sense of Scripture, which he calls the romantic, accepts not only the moral sense of Scripture (psychic), as Philo does, but also a speculative (pneumatic) sense, puts him in a position to constitute, in addition to the *pistis*, a *gnosis*, and nevertheless to combat the perverted interpretations of the heretical Gnostics. The series just

mentioned shows that the theoretical side of religion lay nearest his heart, and similarly his conversions consisted in the most part in the refutation of doubts. In the doctrine of God, as well as elsewhere, he holds fast, in agreement with the great philosophers of antiquity, to the superiority of definiteness over indefiniteness, and therefore constitutes limits to the Divine omnipotence. In the doctrine of the *trinity* he makes an advance upon Justin, in considering the Genesis of the Son as eternal, and the Holy Spirit as raised above creatures; and yet even he does not wholly overcome the relation of subordination. As regards the revelation of God *ad extra*, Origen teaches, not indeed the eternity of the present world; but the previous existence of many other worlds, so that the creative activity of God has never had a beginning. At the same time he maintains decisively that God found no existing material, but created all from nothing. The spirits, created before all other beings, have fallen, and have been placed, according to the degree of their guilt, in various spheres of existence, some as souls in human bodies. (In place of the separate fall of each soul, was put that of the entire race, which it is difficult, it is true, to combine with the pre-existence of individual spirits.) Material existence is therefore not the ground but the accompaniment of sin. Christ, with whose soul, likewise pre-existent, the Logos is joined, becomes flesh in order to give Himself to Satan by his death for a ransom for man. His work is appropriated through belief, which alone justifies, but which has holy works as its fruit. At the same time, belief is never thought of as only a personal relation to Christ, but always as membership in the community of believers. As all are destined for this community, it appears to Origen to be a failure of the divine purpose if a restitution of all things does not bring all into the right way. Even the last enemy will be destroyed, not in substance, but only so that he will cease to be an enemy of God."

The greatest of all the Neoplatonists was Plotinus. He was born 205, A. D., in Egypt. In his twenty-eighth year, he became a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, and remained until the death of his master. In his fortieth year, he

founded his school in Rome, and continued its head until his death in the year 270 A. D. Porphyry arranged the works of Plotinus in groups of nine Enneads.

The following from Erdmann is a good description of the views of Plotinus: "Inasmuch as Plotinus does not, like Plato and Aristotle, approach his peculiar principle gradually, but grasps it immediately by intellectual intuition, and starts from it as from the surest of all things, he must necessarily urge more strongly than his predecessors that that principle is absolutely unconditioned, in no way relative. Unity, Being, Good, God, are the veriest expressions for this highest principle, which is touched neither by the Platonic categories, rest and motion, egoism and altruism, nor by the Aristotelian substance and accident; but is rather the repercussion in which no opposition exists, not even of willing and being. It is because it wills, and it wills because it is. This *protos Theos*, who is not to be conceived of as transcendental, but so exists in all, and embraces all, that when he wills and loves himself he loves and wills all—this God is what Plato called at one time the good, at another time God. As the expression, First God, indicates, Plotinus does not stop with the first principle. Although he does not mistake the difficulty that lies in the way of a progression of plurality from unity, he yet attempts to solve it. Sometimes he proceeds in a strictly logical way, pointing out that plurality excluded from unity, must of that very account be from it and outside of it; ordinarily however, he conceives of the *first* as a producer which, in the same way that flame emits light and snow cold, sends forth from itself, neither unconsciously nor in a wholly arbitrary way, a *second* as eternally begotten. The expressly stated principle that the second always contains less than the first, makes his system contrary to every doctrine of evolution; makes it, that is a system of emanation. The first decadence of being, the first begotten of God, is, according to Plotinus, the nous, who, inasmuch as he proceeds from the One, but at the same time has the *one* as his true ground, and therefore object and end, because in this reflexive relation a knowledge of the One; so that although the One itself does not think, nevertheless

the one thinking it is to be designated as the *eikon*. When, then, Plotinus characterizes the thinking of the *nous* as free and pure thinking, which has to do with itself alone, in distinction from the unfree, which busies itself with another, it is clear that the combination of Plato and Aristotle, derived from Ammonius, is so arranged by him, that Plato's *agathon* occupies the first, the *nous* of Aristotle the second place."

While at times Plotinus seems to have vacillated between monism and dualism, he was in reality a *monist*. This world was to him only a showworld, and he never does show whence matter came. He went so far as to consider it a disgrace to be born, and always concealed the date of his birth. The *Enneads* are in reality the classics of Neoplatonism. The doctrine of Plotinus was mysticism, and like other similar systems has two main divisions. The theoretical part shows the origin of the human soul, and how it departed from its first estate. The practical shows how the soul may return to its God. Augustine said that of all pagan philosophers none came nearer the Christian faith than the Neoplatonists.

A. W. Benn, in his *Greek Philosophers*, gives us the following interesting paragraph on Neoplatonism: "In fixing the relation of Plotinus to his own age, we have gone far towards fixing his relation to all ages, the place which he occupies in the development of philosophy as a connected whole. We have seen that as an attempt to discover the truth of things, his speculations are worthless and worse than worthless, since their method no less than their teaching is false. Nevertheless, Wisdom is justified of her children. Without adding anything to the sum of positive knowledge, Plotinus produced effects upon men's thoughts not unworthy of the great intellect and pure life he devoted to the service of philosophy. No other thinker has accomplished a revolution so immediate, so comprehensive, and of such prolonged duration. He was the creator of Neoplatonism, and Neoplatonism simply annihilated every school of philosophy to which it was opposed. For thirteen centuries or more, the three great systems which had so long divided the suffrages of educated men—Stoicism, Epicureanism, and Skepticism—

ceased to exist, and were allowed to lapse into such complete oblivion that only a few fragments of the works in which they were originally embodied, were preserved. And Plotinus was enabled to do this by the profound insight which led him to strike less at any particular doctrine held by his opponents than at the foundation on which they all stood, the materialism openly held by the Stoics and Epicureans, and assumed by the Skeptics as the necessary presupposition of every dogmatic philosophy. It is true that the principle he opposed to theirs was not of his own origination, although he stated it more powerfully than it had ever been stated before. But to have revived the spiritualism of Plato and Aristotle in such a way as to win for it universal acceptance, was precisely his greatest merit. It is also the only one he would have claimed for himself. As we have already mentioned, he professed to be nothing more than the disciple of Plato. And although Aristotelian ideas abound in his writings, still not only are they over balanced by the platonic element, but Plotinus might justly have contended that they also belonged, in a sense, to Plato, having been originally acquired by a simple development from his teaching."

The influence of Neoplatonism upon modern philosophy has been great. German philosophy has been much influenced by the Idealistic tendencies of Neoplatonism. This is clearly visible in both Spinoza and Shelling. Both Victor Cousin and Sir William Hamilton were influenced by the spirit of Neoplatonism.

Few persons would for a moment think that Herbert Spencer was a disciple of Plotinus. Plotinus taught that the world is a manifestation of an Unknowable Power in much clearer terms than Mr. Spencer. Mr. Spencer constantly asserts that the creative power of which we know nothing is one. His arguments in proof of this are as follows: (1) He identifies the transcendant course of phenomena with the Absolute, and infers that as relativity implies plurality, absoluteness implies unity; (2) He infers the unity of that which underlies force from the mutual convertibility of physical forces. Plotinus proves the same thing by two arguments: (1) From the dependence of the Many on the One; (2) From the unity pervading all

nature. Damascius, a disciple of Plotinus used the expression Unknowable in precisely the sense in which Mr. Spencer uses it. He speaks of the supreme principle as unknowable. He also suggests the question, How can we know that it is unknowable, if we know nothing about the Unknowable?

Mysticism has certainly had a very powerful influence upon both modern Philosophy and Theology. Prof. Josiah Royce traces it back to the Upanishads of the Hindoos. While Dr. Royce, who is a Hegelian, praises Mysticism in many respects, he also shows its great deficiency. It virtually annihilates the many, and knows only the one, according to this distinguished thinker. Modern Idealism is becoming quite Eclectic in many respects, and it is disposed to accept the truths contained in all other systems. While it looks upon Realism and Idealism as the antipodes of each other, it is disposed to find truth in both systems. This is the spirit of Christianity, which proves all things and holds fast to the good. Dr. John Caird gives us the following wise suggestions: "The spiritual life and consciousness of man cannot be broken up into independent divisions or departments existing side by side, or into separate powers or faculties having a common substratum in something which is called the mind; nor is it possible to assert with respect to any of the concrete manifestations of man's spiritual nature, that it is confined to any one form of activity to the exclusion of other and cognate forms. There is no feeling or volition which does not contain in it impliedly an element of knowledge, nor any kind of knowledge, which does not presuppose feeling, or in which the mind is in an attitude simply passive and receptive, without any element of activity."

A better knowledge of psychology would have prevented many extremes in the history of philosophy and Theology. It must be clearly seen by all students that their history has been very similar, and they have largely discussed the same problems. The principle of Thought should characterize our sensations, perceptions, feelings, imaginations in Theology as well as Philosophy. We would, then, avoid many extremes, and spend our energies in advancing a true Christian Civilization.

CHAPTER IV

THE CONTRIBUTION OF SCHOLASTICISM TO BOTH PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

Scholasticism was the philosophy of the middle age. In its widest sense it extended from the 9th century A. D., to the beginning of the fifteenth century, Erigena to Occam and his disciples.

The following from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is a good introduction to Scholasticism: "The fact that the channels of thought during the middle ages were determined in this way by a twofold tradition is usually expressed by saying that reason in the Middle Age is subject to authority. It has not the free play which characterizes its activity in Greece and in the philosophy of modern times. Its conclusions are predetermined, and the initiative of the individual thinker is almost confined, therefore, to formal details in the treatment of his thesis. From the side of the church this characteristic of the period is expressed in the saying that reason has its proper station as the handmaid of faith. But it is only fair to all that this principle of the subordination of the reason wears a different aspect according to the century and writer referred to. In Scotus Erigena, at the beginning of the Scholastic era, there is no such subordination contemplated, because philosophy and theology in his work are implicit unity. According to his memorable expression, '*Conficiter inde veram esse philosophiam veram religionem, conversimque veram religionem esse veram philosophiam.*' Reason with its own strength and with its own instruments evolves a system of the universe, which coincides, according to Erigena, with the Scriptures. For Erigena, therefore, the speculative reason is the supreme arbiter (as he himself indeed expressly asserts); and in accordance with its results the utterance of Scripture and of the

Church have not infrequently to be subjected to an allegorical or mystical interpretation. But this is only to say again in so many words that Erigena is more of a Neoplatonist than a Scholastic. In regard to Scholastics proper, Cousin suggests in reference to this point a threefold chronological division,—at the outset the absolute subordination of philosophy to theology, then the period of their alliance, and finally the period of their separation. In other words, we note philosophy gradually extending its claims. Dialectic, to begin with, is merely a secular art, and only by degrees are its terms and distinctions applied to the subject-matter of theology. The early results of the application, in the hands of Beungarius and Roscellinus, did not seem favorable to Christian orthodoxy. Hence the strength with which a champion of the faith like Aurelius insists on the subordination of reason. To Bernard of Clairvaux and many other conservative churchmen the application of dialectic to the things of faith at all appears as dangerous as it is impious. At a later date, in the systems of the great Schoolman, the rights of reason are fully established and amply acknowledged. The relation of reason and faith remains, it is true, an external one, and certain doctrines—an increasing number as time goes on—are withdrawn from the sphere of reason. But with these exceptions the two march side by side; they establish by different means the same results. For the conflicts which accompanied the first intrusion of philosophy into theological domain more profound and cautious thinkers with a far amplier apparatus of knowledge had substituted a harmony. The constant effort of Scholasticism is to be at once philosophy and theology seemed at last to be satisfactorily realized. But this harmony proved more apparent than real, for the further progress of Scholastic thought consisted in the withdrawal of doctrine after doctrine from the possibility of rational proof and their relegation to the sphere of faith. Indeed, no sooner was the harmony apparently established by Aquinas than Duns Scotus began this negative criticism, which is carried much further by William, of Occam. But this is equivalent to a confession that Scholasticism failed in its task, which was to rationalize the doctrines of the church. The

two authorities refused to be reconciled. The Aristotelian form refused to fit a matter for which it was never intended; the matter of Christian theology refused to be forced into an alien form. The Scholastic philosophy ceased therefore to possess a *raison d'être*, and the spread of the skeptical doctrine of destruction a twofold truth proclaims the destruction of the fabric erected by mediæval thought. The end of the period was thus brought about by the internal decay of its method and principles quite as much as by the variety of external causes which contributed to transfer men's interests to other subjects."

Erdmann uses the following language in reference to the father of Scholasticism: "The fact that in Erigena the principle of Scholasticism makes its appearance as a new or immediate thing, not only gives him the position of an innovator, distrusted by the watchful church, but also causes the oneness of ecclesiastical doctrine and reason to appear immediate, that is, without distinction. On account of the want of distinction every rational ground is to him a source of authority, and the dictum of authority he treats as if it were a ground of reason. The former gives to his philosophizing a heterodox character, the latter a mystical. He philosophizes too much in the manner of the Church Fathers, who had to frame the dogmas, and from this arises his agreement with the Neoplatonists. Nevertheless he regards it as certain that there exists not only a revelation and sacred history, but also ecclesiastical doctrine of irrefragable authority. This is a contradiction. Its solution will be the first step of progress. This will be accomplished by assigning to the distinction between the two sides its proper importance, and by putting reflection in the place of the immediate *intuitus gnosticus*. This reflection proceeds on the one hand from the dogma, as something given to the conception of it; on the other hand, it makes the conception its starting point, and arrives at the dogma as something in agreement with it. Where the union of doctrine and reason is mediate and the results of reflection, both can better secure their rights."

The critics, who claim that there was no philosophy during the Middle Ages make a great mistake. The logic

and theology of the Schoolmen led directly to philosophy. Logical discussion leads to metaphysics, and this was, especially, true with the Scholastics. While the methods of treatment in theology and philosophy may differ, their objects are really the same. Mediaeval thought was largely shaped by the traditions of ancient logic and the system of Christian theology belonging to the Middle Ages. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* says: "Scholasticism opens with a discussion of certain points in the Aristotelian logic; it speedily begins to apply its logical distinctions to the doctrines of the church; and when it attains its full stature of St. Thomas it has, with the exception of certain mysteries, rationalized or Aristotelianized the whole churchly system. Or we might say with equal truth that the philosophy of St. Thomas is Aristotle Christianized. It is, moreover, the attitude of the Schoolmen to these two influences that yields the general characteristic of the period. Their attitude throughout is that of interpreters rather than to those conducting to independent investigation. And though they are at the same time the acutest of critics, and offer the most ingenious developments of the original thesis, they never step outside of the charmed circle of the system they have inherited. They appear to contemplate the universe of nature and of man not at first hand with their own eyes but in the glass of Aristotelian formulae. Their chief works are in the shape of commentaries upon the writings of the philosopher. Their problems and solutions alike spring from the master's dicta—from the need of reconciling these with one another and with the conclusions of Christian theology."

Erigena, although he lived in the ninth century, A. D., was one of the most remarkable men of the middle ages. His influence was such that he has even been compared to Charlemagne himself. He was the founder of Scholasticism, if indeed it can be said to have had a founder. Erigena was a moderate realist, and he, at least, to his own satisfaction, harmonized Plato and Aristotle. He united the Platonic theory of pre-existent exemplars with the Aristotelian of the Universal as in the individual. According to his position, the universals are in the individuals, constituting their essential reality.

The following from Erdmann well presents the position of Erigena: "God as the uncreated Creator, is called *Summa bonitas*. As the One by whom, through whom and to whom is all. He is beginning, middle, and end, and therefore rightly designated as the unity of three *persons*, a thing which can excite offence all the less since every being, above all man, the likeness of God, in its *essentia*, *virtus*, and *operatis*, carries trinity in itself, whether one professes to find it with Augustine in the *esse*, *velle*, and *scire* or with other fathers in the *essentia*, *virtas*, *operatis*, or in the *intellectus sation* and *sensus*. All three form the uncreated creating, for *Pater vult*, *Filius facit*, and *Spiritus perfecit*. God is so completely the ground of all being, that properly there is no being outside of Him. All exists only so far as God appears in it. All being is theophany. The being of God is in no way limited; therefore He is not really a *quid*, does not properly know what He is because He is above every *quid* and in so far may be called *nihil*. It thus becomes possible for Erigena, in verbal agreement with Augustine, to deny the applicability of the categories to God and, with the Areopagite, to place the theology of negation above that of affirmation. Thus all plurality, even of properties, must be excluded from God. His knowledge is will, His will being. What God knows, that He wills, that He is; all is actual only so far as it is in Him, indeed, as it is God. The endless nature of God, this proper *nihilum*, out of which things proceed, according to theologians, becomes in His theophanies a particular being (*aliquid*), so that God, without ceasing to be above things, in them comes into being and creates Himself."

Roscellinus was one of the greatest lights of the Nominalists. There were Nominalists before his day, but his application of this doctrine to the Trinity produced a profound sensation. His doctrine was Tritheism.

Erdmann thus speaks of the strife that then arose: "From the strife of Anselm against the tri-theistic ideas of Roscellinus of Compiègne it is plain that the latter, as we know too from other sources, belonged to the dialecticians who, like Heiric (Eric), of Auxerre for instance, and others educated in the school of Fulda, save in the universals, after the example of Marcianus Capella mere words,

or at least abstractions of the understanding copied from individual things, which alone actually exist. Anselm, on the contrary, held fast to the Platonism which, more than a century before, Remigius of Auxerre, pupil and successor of Heiric and afterwards teacher in Paris, had made current, in his commentaries upon Marcianus Capella. Remigius' pupil, Otto, of Cluny, also had followed his master in this respect. It may, indeed, be carried back still further, since Erigena Platonizes in the same way, although, to be sure, in him as epoch-making, and therefore containing latent in himself all that stirs his age, the first germs of the opposite opinion may also be discovered. The church, in this strife, not only condemned the dogmatic heresy, but at the same time declared against the metaphysical principles, and therefore elevated an old dialectic controversy of the schools to a leading question of the church. This, however, was not an abjuration of the wisdom, she had elsewhere shown, *e. g.* in connection with the strife of Augustine and Palagius in regard to Traducianism, but it proceeded from the perfectly correct feeling that whosoever ascribes more reality to things than to ideas is more attached to this world than to the ideal kingdom of heaven. Therefore, it is not blind devotion to his own opinions which leads Anselm, to call such dialectics heretical, but for every careful observer the significance which a person ascribes to the universals is a standard of his relation towards the Church. From this arises the fact that in that age the names of the various tendencies are drawn from the predicates which each of them attaches to the universals. Whoever like Anselm, proceeds from the fundamental principle that *universalia sunt ante res*, and accordingly asserts that they are themselves *res*, or at least *realia* is called a *realis*, later a realist. Whoever, on the contrary, like Roscellinus, holds that universals are the abstractions of things, and therefore *post res*, are mere *voces* or *nomina*, is called a *vocalis* or *nominalis*, later a nominalist. As it is no accident that the realists are the more ecclesiastical, it is likewise none that the nominalist are intellectually the less important. At this time, for when the problem becomes the undermining of the mediaeval, world-conquering Church, the nominalists will

show that they better understand the age, that is, that they are the greater philosophers.”

Abelard, the founder of Conceptualism, was the most noted figure in the first half of the twelfth century. He was the pupil of both Roscellinus and William of Champeaux, and they impressed him as having gone to opposite extremes; so he proposed to mediate between extreme realism and extreme idealism. Philosophers differ as to his real position; Ritter and Erdmann claim that he was a moderate Realist, occupying the position of Aristotle, while Cousin and Ueberweg look upon him as essentially a Nominalist. As he wrote against both extreme Realism and extreme Nominalism, it is not difficult to see how both parties would claim him. His application of dialectic to theology got him into trouble. While he opposed the Tritheism of Roscellinus, his own position was condemned by the church. He went to exactly the opposite extreme; instead of the Tritheism of the Nominalists, he reduced the three persons of the Trinity to three attributes of the Divine Being—Power, Wisdom, and Love. St. Bernard bitterly opposed this position, and he carried the church with him. Bernard declared that Abelard held the same position on the Trinity as Arius; that his position on grace was that of Pelagius; and that on the person of Christ he held the views of Nestorius. Bernard declared that while Abelard tried to prove Plato a Christian, he proved himself to be a pagan. It must be admitted, that this great thinker had a strong rationalistic tendency; for he himself declared that he did not believe a doctrine because God revealed it, but because he was convinced by his reason.

Albertus Magnus introduced the greatest period of Scholasticism. He was born 1193 in Swabia, and died at Cologne in 1280. His name is inseparably connected with that of his greatest pupil, Thomas Aquinas. The philosophy of Aquinas is simply that of Magnus carried out to greater completeness. These distinguished philosophers reproduced the whole system of Aristotle in systematic order, and remodeled it so as to meet the requirements of the church. The following from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is interesting: “The monotheistic influence of Aristotle and his Arabian commentators shows itself in

Albert and Aquinas, at the outset, in the definitive fashion in which the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation are henceforth detached from the sphere of rational or philosophical theology. So long as the Neoplatonic influence remained strong, attempts were still made to demonstrate the doctrine of the Trinity, chiefly in a mystical sense as in Erigena, but also by orthodox churchmen like Anselm. Orthodoxy, whether Catholic or Protestant, has since generally adopted Thomas's distinction. The existence of God is maintained by Albert and Aquinas to be demonstrable by reason; but here again they reject the ontological argument of Anselm, and restrict themselves to the *a posteriori* proof, rising after the manner of Aristotle from that which is prior to us (*πρότερον πρὸς ἡμᾶς*) to that which is prior to nature or in itself (*πρότερον ψήσει*). God is not fully comprehensible by us, says Albert, because the finite is not able to grasp the infinite, yet he is not altogether beyond our knowledge; our intellects are touched by a ray of his light, and through this contact we are brought into communion with him. God, as the only sub-sistent and necessary being, is the creator of all things. Here the Scholastic philosophy comes in conflict with Aristotle's doctrine of the eternity of the world. Albert and Aquinas alike maintain the beginning of the world in time; time itself only exists since the moment of this miraculous creation. But Thomas, though he holds the fact of creation to be rationally demonstrable, regards the beginning of the world in time as only an article of faith, the philosophical arguments for and against being inconclusive."

The position of Albert and Thomas was opposed by Duns Scotus and William of Occam. They were probably the greatest defenders of the Nominalist cause. They were Franciscans, and this order generally tended to Nominalism, while the Dominicans almost universally espoused the cause of the Realists. Scotus freely confessed his inability to rationalize the leading Christian doctrines, and consequently founded them upon the arbitrary will of God. Those who study the discussion carefully will reach the conclusion that the disciples of Aquinas tended to rationalism, while those of Scotus

tended to skepticism. The name which is historically associated with that of Scotus is William of Occam. He severely condemns the Realists for what he believed to be their absurd abstractions. He maintained that everything that exists by the mere fact of its existence is individual. He considered the individual the only reality whether it be the individual thing in the external world or the individual state in the world of mind. It is not the individual things, he declared, that needs explanation, but the universal. He agreed with Scotus that theology is not a science, but emphasized its practical character. He also agreed with his master in making the arbitrary will of God the foundation of morality.

The greatest literary light of the Scholastic period was the poet Dante. This great man was born in Florence in 1265. He was aroused to poetic enthusiasm by his early love for Beatrice. The early death of the object of his affection nearly drove him mad. He devoted himself to the study of philosophy, and espoused the cause of the Realists. He allied himself with the Ghibelline party, and opposed the tyranny of the Papacy. He declared that the well-being of Italy and the world depended upon the possession of strong power by an Emperor, but not of the Pope. On account of his political views he was banished from Florence and died in exile.

Dante was one of the four or five greatest writers of the world, and his most noted work is the *Divine Comedy*. No one but a Realist like Dante could have written it. The graphic pictures contained in it were very real to the great poet. He presented in poetic form the doctrine of Albert and Thomas. He placed the doctrine of the great Realists in a form that would interest all mankind.

We learn the doctrine of Dante in his sublime poem, in a passage through Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise, to each of which a third part of the poem is devoted. His political as well as his religious and philosophical views are unfolded in the poem. The cotemporaries of Dante honored Virgil as the true representative of human knowledge before the days of Dante. Albert is Dante's master in physics, and Thomas in politics and religion. Our poet was a great astronomer of his age; he was perfectly familiar

with most of the constellations, and frequently criticised the corrupt calanders of his day.

Virgil is Dante's guide to the regions below. He found that punishment in hell was according to the sins of the individual. The persons he specially describes as in the lowest depths of hell are Brutus and Judas Iscariot; the one the assassin of Caesar, and the other the betrayer of Christ. The second part of the poem is devoted to Purgatory. Virgil the symbol of reason inculcating wisdom without revelation continues the guide. Dante expresses no hope for those who do not repent. He was a restorationist. In passing from Purgatory to Paradise, Virgil is relieved by Statius, who is a symbol of philosophy already sanctified by Christianity. The poet finds Beatrice in Paradise, and gives a beautiful description of her spiritual loveliness.

We are perfectly safe in concluding that Scholasticism had a very great influence upon both philosophy and theology; and I do not believe that I am going too far when I say that it has largely been the foundation of both modern philosophy and theology. A thorough knowledge of Scholasticism is very valuable in the discussion of modern theological problems. Many points in theology, which divide Christendom today, were ably discussed by the great Scholastics. Some of the great reformers, who really wrote against Scholasticism, were themselves Scholastics. Even Lord Bacon was much more of a Scholastic than his disciples would be willing to admit. The prejudice that some writers maintain against the Scholastics is a great mistake. Victor Cousin has done much towards removing this prejudice, and giving to the modern world a true view of the great preparatory work of the Scholastics.

While Philosophy has had a powerful influence upon Theology, the fact must be recognized that the influence has been mutual. In both India and Greece the origin of Philosophy is most closely related to Religion. In the history of the modern world the same thing is largely true. It was especially true during the middle age. The middle age was one of transition; and while progress was slow, still progress was made. The middle age was necessary

to the modern age, and the Philosophy and Theology of the middle age, were necessary to the Philosophy and Theology of the modern age. Scholasticism was the philosophic expression of the middle age, and without the middle age, Scholasticism could never have existed. Dante and the great artists of the middle age show clearly that it was something more than a period of inactivity and stagnation. Each age has its own special work in the progress of civilization, and its mission will never be exactly repeated by another age. We should not therefore under-value the Philosophy and Theology of the middle age.

CHAPTER V

THE MUTUAL CONTRIBUTION OF FRENCH PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

SECTION ONE

Sensationalism in France

It is generally admitted that Condillac was the founder of French Sensationalism. He was an opponent of Descartes and a disciple of Locke. He had not the religious influence of his master, and consequently nothing to restrain him from his materialistic tendencies. In his work on the Origin of Knowledge, he showed his extreme tendency to Sensationalism in the way in which he explained reflection. Locke had clearly distinguished the active powers of the mind from the passive; while he made sensations strictly passive, he claimed that there are other powers brought into exercise by our own wills. While Sensation is passive, Reflection is active; and the active powers from the material afforded by the senses, construct ideas for themselves. While Condillac at first admitted with Locke that there are two sources of knowledge, before he got through with his treatise, he practically identified Sensation and Reflection, and made Sensation the only source of knowledge. He denied the freedom of the will, and made man strictly a passive being. This part of his philosophy certainly had an influence upon the fatalistic theology of his times. It may be that fatalism in religion also influenced fatalism in philosophy.

Condillac's next philosophical treatise was on *Sensations*, and it showed a still greater tendency to Sensationalism than his first work. In this he abandoned entirely the position of Locke, and boldly aspired to be the apostle of Sensationalism. He does not hesitate to advocate the absurd position that all the powers of the human mind are

only transformed sensations. If he had laid aside his pre-conceived theory and thought rationally for a few moments, he could have readily seen that attention is active and voluntary, and that we can continue it or suspend it at our will. This one truth clearly perceived would have undermined his whole theory of Sensationalism. This deleterious philosophy had a ruinous effect upon both Church and State. The successors of Condillac went into the most daring Atheism.

While Bonnet and other disciples of Condillac made an effort to return to the position of Locke and advocated the immortality of the soul, Helvetius, Saint Lambert, Baron d' Holbach and others pushed the philosophy of Condillac into the gloomy depths of atheism. Helvetius wrote on ethics from the standpoint of Sensationalism, and founded his whole system upon selfishness. He maintained that pleasure is the only good, and that self-interest is the true ground of morality; upon which both individual action and political right depends. Saint Lambert claimed that as man possesses only sensations his sole good consists in and his personal duty depends upon personal judgment. In order to find the highest good, this selfish philosophy insists that he should simply seek his own enjoyment. It is not difficult to see how this materialistic philosophy ruined both Church and State. In his *Système de la Nature*, Baron d' Holbach advocated such extreme materialism, fatalism and atheism, that even Voltaire condemned the system as illogical in its deductions, absurd in its physics, and abominable in its morality. Sensationalism tended to undermine the foundations of morality, religion and government, and it was certainly one of the most productive causes of the terrible French Revolution.

SECTION TWO

Religious Philosophy in France

Philosophy has always concerned itself with the nature of the external world, with the nature of man, and with the nature of God. When it devotes itself exclusively to

the external world, the nature of man and the nature of God are included in this, and the result is Sensationalism. When it devotes itself exclusively to the nature of man, the other two are included in an Idealistic Philosophy. When it devotes itself exclusively to the nature of God, the other two are included in the Philosophy of the Absolute. The Golden Mean Philosophy includes them all.

France has produced a Religious Philosophy as well as a materialistic one. She can also claim the reputation of having produced the first great modern continental philosopher. This was the celebrated Descartes. He was born in France in 1596, and died in Holland in 1650. He was educated by the Jesuits, and become especially noted for his progress in mathematics. His religious education had more influence upon him than he himself thought. In his doctrine of the will, he was probably influenced by Calvinism. While a soldier he resolved to be a philosopher, and actually began his system. He took the Baconian principles and applied them to the study of the human mind. They both appealed to the observation of facts as the foundation of all knowledge; and while Bacon confined his work largely to the outer world, Descartes confined his largely to the facts of consciousness. Steward claims that he stands at the head of the whole modern movement of metaphysical philosophy. His famous sentence, "*Cogito, ergo sum*," is simply an appeal to the veracity of consciousness. The fact of your thinking certainly implies a thinking being and thought itself. The late President R. Graham, of Kentucky University, one of my first university professors, was a strict disciple of Descartes.

Francis Bowen, long a professor in Harvard University, thus speaks of this fundamental principle of Descartes: "Here we have a first principle, then, and it is not only unassailable, but fruitful. *Cogito, ergo sum*. The reality of the thought necessarily involves the existence of the thinker. Two steps, then, are already taken and solidly planted. If there are any truths of fact or concrete existence, as distinct from the mere relations of abstract ideas,—truths which skepticism itself can not doubt, these are they. On this subject, the philosophy of the last two

centuries and a half has not advanced an inch beyond Descartes, nor rendered nugatory the smallest portion of his work. On these two most certain of all propositions depends the certainty of all other affirmations that can be made. The one cannot be denied without self-contradiction, that is, without violating the primary axiom of pure thought, that all thought must be consistent with itself; thought is known, because both knowledge and skepticism are thought. The other, my personal existence, is at once the type of all reality, and the measure of all certainty. The contrast between the real and the apparent, as it is a relation between them, must have a *fundamentum relationis*, or a standard through which it can be thought. This standard cannot be found in the apparent, as this is the mere negation, the opposite, of the real. There must be, then, a standard or type of reality; and this can be nothing but the Ego, which thinks the relation, and without which, consequently, the difference between the real and apparent could not even be thought. It is also the criterion and measure of all certainty, as well in the apprehension of the vulgar as in the reasoning of the learned; for the common remark, 'I am as sure as I am of my own existence,' expresses the strongest conviction of which the human mind is capable, and that to which all other assurance is referred."

While Descartes largely borrowed his Ontological argument for the existence of God from Mediæval Theology, he is due the credit of introducing it into modern philosophy. If we interrogate our consciousness, he claimed that there is one conception out of all others, which stands forth by its uniqueness above all others, and this is the conception of God. As the idea of the Divine existence is the clearest of all others, we must have sufficient proof from consciousness of the existence of God. This argument is very valuable taken in connection with the argument from effect to cause. Descartes saw this point, and connected the two. The existence of a dependent being implies the existence of an independent one. Man exists as a dependent being, and God consequently exists as an independent one.

Malebranche was one of the greatest of the disciples of

Descartes, and did much towards counteracting a materialistic philosophy. He was a theologian as well as a philosopher, and made important contributions to both theology and philosophy. His observations were acute, his thoughts lofty, and his style attractive. His great work, "De Recherche de la Verite," was one of the strongest defences of higher spiritual truth to be found in any language.

Malebranche was a disciple of Plato, as well as of Descartes, and advocated largely the position of the Greek philosopher on the doctrine of ideas. He did not think that the mind could perceive objects directly, but only through the medium of ideas. It was one of the main purposes of the Scotch school to refute this doctrine of mediate perception through the intervention of ideas. This great Frenchman also claimed that these ideas exist in God, and that we behold them there through our union with God. In truth, he said what other conception can we have of the omnipresence of God, than that he is present to all things and to all minds, and that his infinite substance is the place or home of spirits, just as boundless space is, in one sense, the place of bodies. Malebranche believed with Paul that in God we live and move and have our being. He clearly taught God's immanence in nature.

Malebranche believed in the freedom of the will. Prof. Francis Bowen gives the following difference between him and Spinoza: "Here, I confess, is the main difference between the philosophy of Spinoza and Malebranche; but it is a distinction which is world-wide. Both alike resolve all phenomenal action and change in the physical universe, outward human agency itself included, and all manifestations of that universe, into the mind of God; and so its very substance, so far as we know, into the infinite action and sole efficiency of the *divine nature*. God alone moves and acts, else he would not be God,—would not be infinite or absolute. But the Christian Plato reserves free will—the unfettered purpose and intention—and so the proper individual being, of a man, as that with which he was endowed at creation, and which, in fact, constitutes creation; while the remorseless Jew

merges this also into the phantom of infinite substance, and linked altogether by blind fate, erects his vision of a blind God—universe, which is one and all.”

Malebranche was no pantheist, but a Christian philosopher. Modern science favors his theory of the unity of force, and its direction by intelligence. It also favors his position of the immanence of God in nature.

Eclecticism in France

At the beginning of the Nineteenth Century Materialism was the dominant philosophy in France. In fact, it was almost the only philosophy; even Cartesianism was quietly resting until the dawn of a better day. The school of Condillac had gone to such extremes, that protests began to appear from philosophers belonging to this school itself. Among the names that might be mentioned are M. Laromiguire, M. Royer-Collard and others.

When M. Royer-Collard became professor of metaphysics in Paris, he began to set at defiance the authority of Condillac, and proclaimed a higher spiritual philosophy. He had been a careful student of the Scottish philosophy and thought it his duty to direct the same arguments against the school of Condillac that Reid had directed against Hume. His success was great, and it led to the revival of Cartesianism in France. The French people were well prepared for there had been a great reaction against Sensationalism. Even Napoleon Bonaparte had severely criticized Sensationalism as incapable of showing anything great in human destiny.

M. de Biran was another Frenchman, who did much towards advancing the cause of a higher spiritual philosophy in France. The great fact of consciousness, which he especially developed, was the power of the will. Sensationalism, which dwelt almost entirely upon outward influences, ignored the activity of the human mind, and denied the freedom of the human will. In Theology, Sensationalism tended to fatalism, while the higher spiritualistic philosophy taught the freedom of the will.

While Sensationalism was a great extreme, it did nevertheless contain much truth, and it did advance the physical

sciences. The time had now arrived for the combination of the truths contained in all the systems into a higher Eclecticism. Victor Cousin steps upon the stage as the founder of modern Eclecticism. He was born in 1792, and when quite young became a student of the normal school of Paris. In 1811 he had the good fortune to attend the lectures of M. Laromiguiere. These made a deep impression upon his mind. He next became a student of M. Royer-Collard, and determined to devote his life to the investigation and promulgation of moral and spiritual truth. His progress was such that upon the retirement of M. Royer-Collard in 1815, he was appointed to the chair of this distinguished philosopher. He carried on his work with the greatest energy for five years, and was in 1820 arrested by the contemptible government of the restored Bourbons. The philosopher considered this fortunate for himself, for he had exhausted his resources as furnished by his studies of the French and Scottish schools, and this gave him an opportunity to go to Germany. He went to work to learn the German language, and became a pupil of the great Hegel. After the revolution, which placed Louis Phillippe upon the throne, he was recalled to France, and became almost a national idol. The new government made him a peer in France, and in 1840 he was created Minister of Public Instruction.

Cousin recognized two methods of investigation,—the rationalistic and the psychological. The German method was largely rationalistic; but he had been trained under the psychological. While he acknowledged his many obligations to the Germans, his own method was largely the psychological. He regarded the German method as deductive, while his own was inductive. He applied the Baconian organum to the facts of consciousness. He enumerates among the facts of consciousness three generic classes,—(1) those of the will; (2) those of the reason; (3) those of sensation. On the activity of the human mind, Cousin largely adopted the theory of M. de Biran. His theory of reason is much the same as that of Kant and his successors. Sensation with Cousin as with most philosophers is that faculty of the mind by which we become acquainted with the outer world.

The Eclecticism of Cousin and his school has had a great influence upon Theology. It has tended to make Theology more Eclectic. It has advanced the cause of Comparative Theology. It is in harmony with the Apostle Paul, who says, "Prove all things, and hold fast to that which is good." Eclecticism in its true and highest sense is in harmony with the Golden Mean Philosophy, which avoids extremes, and accepts the truth, wherever found, on Christian or on heathen ground.

CHAPTER VI

THE CONTRIBUTION OF GERMAN PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

Spinoza

Spinoza is one of the most remarkable men in the history of modern Philosophy. He was a Jew and thoroughly versed in the history of this remarkable race. He was also interested in the history of Christianity and was greatly influenced by the Theology of Augustine. He was an intensely religious man, and has wielded a powerful influence upon modern Theology, especially what might be termed Mystical Theology. This distinguished philosopher has usually been termed an infidel, but this is certainly a misrepresentation. His system has extreme tendencies, it is true, but Spinoza was a devout worshipper of God.

This great philosopher was born in Amsterdam, in 1632. He was a Jew, but was expelled from the Jewish Church on account of his religious views. He was considered a disciple of Descartes, and both Jews and Christians looked with suspicion upon all adherents of the Cartesian philosophy. Spinoza's system has been called Pantheism and it certainly does tend in that direction; but Spinoza taught that God could think, feel and will. To him, God was all in all, and in him we live and move and have our being. To him, God is the eternal and independent *Substance* from whom all things come. Novalis called him the God-intoxicated man. His proof of the existence of God was the fact that there can be but one infinite, eternal, and self-existent substance. Spinoza taught that the fact of God's self-existence involved the idea of his

freedom, for nothing could limit his power. This philosopher taught that man's thought was a mode of the divine thought, and that his body was a mode of the divine extension. Man's freedom is involved in God's freedom.

For a number of years after beginning the study of philosophy, I, like others, looked upon Spinoza as an infidel. In conversation with a distinguished Jewish Rabbi, he informed me that he was a disciple of Spinoza. I could not see how a distinguished religious teacher could be the disciple of a man, whom I regarded as an atheist. I determined to restudy the Philosophy of Spinoza, and a more careful investigation has made me look upon his system with more favor. He was an extremist, but his system contains much truth. He taught the Higher Pantheism which was regarded with favor by the poet Tennyson.

In religion, Spinoza was a mystic. His religious teachings remind you of that orthodox book "Imitation of Christ." His theory influenced the Mystical Theology of the Germans, and through them the whole Christian world. Christian Mystics frequently quote the thoughts of Spinoza, and would be horror-stricken if they knew whence they came. How often indeed have great teachers been considered infidels in this world, when, in reality, they were the most religious of men.

We will conclude what we have to say about Spinoza in the following language of Prof. Josiah Royce: "In the fifth part of Spinoza's Ethics, his description of the wise man's love of God closes his wonderful exposition. This love is superior to fortune, renounces all hopes and escapes all fears, feeds alone on the thought that God's mind is the only mind, loves God with a fragment of 'that very love wherewith God loves himself.' The wise man thus wanders on earth in whatever state you will—poor, an outcast, weak, near to bodily death; but his meditation is not of death, but of life, of the life wherewith he is a part, and has ever been and ever will be a part. You may bound him in a nut-shell, but he counts himself king of infinite space; and rightly, for the bad dreams of this phantom life have ceased to trouble him. His blessedness, says Spinoza, 'is not the reward of his virtue, but his

virtue itself. He rejoices therein, not because he has controlled his lusts; contrariwise, because he rejoices therein, the lusts of the finite have no power over him.' Thus appears how potent, then, is the wise man, and how much he surpasses the ignorant man, who is driven only by his lusts. For the ignorant man is not only distracted in various ways by external causes, without gaining true acquiescence of mind, but moreover lives, as it were, unwitting of himself and of God and of things, and, as soon as he ceases to suffer, ceases also to be. Whereas, the wise man, in so far as he is regarded as such, is scarcely at all disturbed in spirit, but being conscious of himself and of God and of things, by a certain eternal necessity, never ceases to be, but always possesses true acquiescence of his spirit. If the way which I have pointed out as leading to this result seems exceedingly hard, it may, nevertheless, be discovered. Needs must be hard since it is seldom found. Now would it be possible if salvation were ready to our hand, and could without great labor be found, that it should be by almost all men neglected? But all things excellent are as difficult as they are rare.' "

SECTION ONE

Leibnitz

The following from Prof. Francis Bowen, in his *Modern Philosophy*, is very suggestive: "With the single exception of Aristotle, I suppose that Leibnitz was the most comprehensive genius that ever lived. Other men have been as industrious, and have become as learned, as he; they have also aimed at original speculation on as great variety of topics. But they have sacrificed success in any one department to this dream of universal empire; they might have accomplished more, had they attempted less. Leibnitz alone, in modern times, attempted everything, and left his mark on all that he undertook. Even at the present day, there is hardly a science, hardly a field of study, research, or speculation, which does not bear the impress of his labors, or the history of which could not be fully written without the frequent mention of his name.

'As some of the ancient charioteers,' said Fontenelle, 'could guide eight horses yoked side by side, so Leibnitz drove forward all the sciences abreast.' Historian, jurisprudent, philologist, mathematician, physicist, theologian, moralist, and philosopher, even those who began by censuring the multiplicity of his pursuits, after reviewing what he actually accomplished, the new problems that he started, and the many pregnant hits of future discoveries for which science is indebted to him, have been compelled at last to doubt, as Dugald Stewart says, whether he could have accelerated the advancement of knowledge by the concentration of his studies more than he has actually done by the universality of his aims; and whether he does not afford one of the few instances to which the words of the poet may be literally applied: '*si non errasset, fecerat ille minus.*' He shares equally with Sir Isaac Newton, the glory of inventing the Differential and Integral Calculus; his doctrine that the force is not simply as the velocity, but as the square of the velocity, after raising a controversy that lasted over a century after his time, is now admitted as a first principle in science; his announcement of the Law of Continuity, that nature never proceeds *per saltum*, and its corollary, of the existence of a scale of beings varying by imperceptible gradations, accepted almost at once in a large department of research, was adopted as late as 1866 by Mr. W. R. Grove, the president of the British Association, as the latest and broadest generalization of all the science of our own day; the doctrines first proclaimed by him, of the Sameness of Indiscernibles, and of the need of a Sufficient Reason for all things, are among the most comprehensive and fruitful principles ever introduced into the field of purely speculative philosophy; his theory of Monads, in at least one of its many phases, is probably admitted by the most scientific minds of the present time; his system of Optimism, verified by Pope and ridiculed by Boyle and Voltaire, has not yet ceased to be eagerly discussed in the schools of systematic ethics and theology; and his purely metaphysical principles, of Pre-established Harmony and the criteria of Innate Ideas, created the modern philosophy of Germany, and, through that, are

even now largely affecting the course of thought in cultivated minds throughout Europe and America."

While Leibnitz was, in many respects, a disciple of Descartes, he thought that this great French philosopher had gone to one extreme; and that Locke, the great English philosopher, had gone to the other. He did not agree with either one on the doctrine of innate ideas. He readily saw the vulnerable point in Locke's philosophy. While ideas were not innate, he insisted that the intellect itself was innate. While Locke's fundamental source of all knowledge was experience, which position tended to Empiricism; the fundamental source with Leibnitz was the necessary laws of the human understanding, which position tended to Rationalism. Both positions were carried to an extreme, and the Golden Mean Philosophy comprehends the truths contained in both of them. The *Theodicee* is perhaps the greatest work written by Leibnitz. It is an important discussion on the eternal goodness of God, on the origin of evil and the liberty of man. In all these departments important contributions are made to modern Theology. In this work the great philosopher fully explains and defends his system of Optimism. This is another important contribution to Theology. His *Monadology* is another one of Leibnitz's greatest works. In this work, he teaches that God is the great Monad, and that all Monads are active. The human soul is a *monad* and indistructible. He presents strong arguments for the immortality of the soul, and in this way, contributes to modern Theology. When we come to American philosophy, we will show that even Wilford Hall was a disciple of Leibnitz.

SECTION TWO

Kant

Immanuel Kant, one of the greatest of German philosophers, was born at Königsberg, Prussia, in 1724, and died at the same place in 1804. His family were originally Scotch, and spelt the name Cant. In order to prevent its mispronunciation, the philosopher changed it to Kant.

The father of the philosopher was a saddler, and a man of decided integrity. While his father was Scotch, his mother was German; and although a woman somewhat severe and exacting, she possessed great piety. Her early influence upon her illustrious son was very great. Kant, like Shelling and Hegel, was intended for the ministry; and he did preach a few times. His early training was largely under the influence of what is called Pietism, and it seems to have made an indelible impression upon his mind. He was always noted for the highest morality, and was a diligent student of the Sermon on the Mount. (See the author's *Cultura*.)

The Kantian philosophy divides itself into three *Kritiks*, viz., The *Kritik* of Pure Reason, The *Kritik* of Practical Reason, The *Kritik* of the Faculty of Judgment. In the *Kritik* of Pure Reason, Kant maintains that space and time are only subjective forms, and have no objective reality. His principle is that we do not know things in themselves, but only phenomena. He insisted, however, upon the reality of the external world, and would not admit that the world of sense was a mere appearance. He was very much irritated at the use made by Fichte of his subjective tendency. Kant's views of space and time have had a great influence on modern Theology. A few years ago at an annual meeting of the American Institute of Christian Philosophy, I listened to a very interesting discussion on the subject between Dr. Wilson of Cornell University, and Dr. Bowne, of Boston University. Dr. Wilson took the position that space and time were nothing, and Dr. Bowne insisted that they had outward reality.

In the *Kritik* of Practical Reason, Kant claims that the will is the highest spiritual power in man, and is even above pure reason. Some of its principles have an imperative character, and there the categorical imperative expresses the most important thought in the ethical theory of Kant. This implies freedom, for on no other ground is moral action possible. It also implies the existence of God, for otherwise there would be a law without a Lawgiver, which is an absurdity. It further implies a future, where man's moral nature will find its completion. While pure

reason only shows these things to be possible, practical reason shows them to be certain, by basing them upon the moral nature of man. I have often heard theologians in lectures against philosophy employing the arguments of Kant, not, of course, knowing whence they came.

In the *Kritik of the Faculty of Judgment*, Kant bridges the chasm between theoretical and practical reason, just as feeling occupies an intermediate position between the reason and the will. Of course, his distinction between the theoretical and practical reason is arbitrary. Kant in his third *Kritik* makes the aesthetic elements in man's nature confirm the teaching of the practical reason on the great questions of the existence of God and the immortality of man. The poet Schiller was a disciple of Kant, and has been one great instrument in introducing the Kantian philosophy into Theology. The following language of Kant is often repeated by Theologians: "I am very ignorant of the nature of things; but I do know my duty, and I am determined to live as under God's eye."

O living will that shalt endure
When all that seems shall suffer shock,
Rise in the spiritual rock,
Flow thro' our deeds and make them pure,

That we may lift from out of dust
A voice as unto him that hears,
A cry above the conquer'd years
To one that with us works, and trust,

With faith that comes of self-control,
The truths that never can be proved
Until we close with all we loved,
And all we flow from, soul in soul.

TENNYSON

SECTION THREE

Hegel

Fichte, the immediate successor of Kant, carried the idealistic tendency of the Kantian philosophy into what has been called subjective idealism. While this distin-

guished philosopher was an extreme idealist, he was not an atheist as some have thought. He claimed that his Theology was the same as that of the apostle John. He was fond of quoting, "I am the vine, and ye are the branches." To Fichte, the will of man, pointed to the Supreme Will in this universe. He said, "Supreme and living will, whom no name names, to thee may I lift up my soul, for thou and I are not parted. Thy voice sounds in me, and mine again in thee; and all my thoughts, if only they be true, are thought in thee." Shelling was the counterpart of Fichte; he was an objective idealist. He was a Romanticist, and loved nature intensely. We should never know God, according to his view, if we did not share his nature in our emotions. Shelling considered the outer world as God's thought shown to our eyes, and the inner world as God's thought shown to our consciousness. In the inner world God's thought becomes conscious of itself. Through the poet Goethe and others, the philosophy of Shelling has made important contributions to modern Theology. In fact, the great Theologian, Schleiermacher himself, was a disciple of Shelling. It is also proper to state here that the philosopher Jacobi was an important contributor to the theology of Schleiermacher.

Hegel, the founder of absolute idealism, was born at Stuttgart in 1770, and died of cholera in Berlin, in 1831. He was a disciple of Shelling; but finally went far beyond his master, and established a system of his own. With the possible exception of Kant and Leibnitz, Hegel was the greatest of German philosophers. The principal works in the study of the Hegelian philosophy are the *Phenomenology of the Spirit*, published in 1807, and the *Science of Logic* published about seven years afterwards. The first presents the system of Hegel by the analytic methods, and the second by the synthetic. The *Phenomenology* resolves the All into one, and the *Logic* develops one into the All. In the analytic process, the Absolute Idea is reached, which is the point of departure of the development of One into the All. The *Phenomenology of Spirit* and the *Science of Logic*, thus become the complements of each other. There are important points of

similarity between the system of Hegel and the philosophy of Herbert Spencer. For example, Mr. Spencer's theory of the law of growth whereby homogeneity is developed into heterogeneity. Hegel's philosophy was very popular among the orthodox, and it consequently had a great influence upon German Theology. In fact, Hegel always considered himself an orthodox Lutheran.

It is claimed by many of Hegel's critics that he was a Pantheist and did not believe in a personal God. In a sense, he was certainly a Pantheist, but the Higher Pantheism teaches the divine personality. Tennyson was a Higher Pantheist, but he believed in the personality of God. Dr. W. T. Harris, U. S. Commissioner of Education, is a Hegelian, and he firmly believes in the personality of God. Hegel claimed that his philosophy was in perfect harmony with revelation. It has also been claimed by his critics that Hegel did not believe in Christ and a future state. While his philosophy is not as plain on these points as we could desire, he certainly did believe that his system was in harmony with Revelation and was himself a consistent member of the church. We cannot understand his attitude in reference to Christianity unless he did believe in the divinity of Christ and in a future state. Hegel asked the question, What is Revelation which reveals nothing? and he claimed that the essence of revelation consisted in revealing God as the Triune One. It is not going too far to say that the orthodox preachers of Germany were in philosophy largely the disciples of Hegel.

It would be difficult to estimate the contribution of the Hegelian Philosophy to Modern Theology. Hegel took a stand in direct opposition to the Rationalism of his day. He called it flat nonsense and dead formalism. In opposition to it he advocated orthodoxy, and even quoted from and praised the scholastics. He even claimed that the Rationalists had no theology, as God was to them unknown, and that consequently they could say nothing about him. The Right Wing of the Hegelian Philosophy, which was composed of many of the most learned theologians of Germany, claimed that Hegelianism alone could mediate between Supernaturalism and Rationalism. Through the Theology of Germany, Hegelianism has

greatly contributed to the Theology of Christendom. Dr. William T. Harris, in his work on Hegel's Logic, says, "In 1866 I arrived at the first insight that is distinctively Hegelian and the most important aperçu of Hegel's logic. I wrote this out in a letter to my friend, Adolph E. Kroeger, an ardent Fichtean and was endeavoring to proselyte for Hegel. I called it the distinction between comprehension (or Begriff), and Idea (Idee). It should really be the distinction that Hegel makes between negative unity or substantiality and Begriff or Idee. It is undoubtedly Hegel's highest thought. It is the insight into the nature of true being to be altruistic and to exist in the self-activity of others. It is the thought that lies at the basis of the doctrine of unity, though rather in a logical implication than as a conscious idea. It is also the highest goal of the Platonic-Aristotelian system, indicated in the assertion that God is without envy ('The Timæus and The Metaphysics), also in the doctrine of the Good as the highest category." The contribution of the Left Wing of the Hegelian Philosophy to Theology will be considered in another chapter.

Hermann Lotze, the greatest of recent German philosophers, has been an important contributor to Theology from the standpoint of physiological-psychology. Joseph Cook, in his Boston Monday lectures quoted him more frequently than he did any other philosopher. Lotze's Theism is pronounced, and on the question of Evolution, his position is much the same as that of Prof. Dana, of Yale. Ulrici, in his doctrine of a Spiritual Body, has made important contributions to Theological Science. Ulrici was professor of philosophy in the University of Halle and one of the greatest philosophers in Germany. His great book, "Gott und die Mensch," was published in 1874, in which he advocates a spiritual body, much the same as revealed in the Bible. His book is an important contribution to the doctrine of a future state. He was also evidently indebted to Paul for some of his highest conceptions. German Philosophy and Theology have always been very intimately related, and their mutual contributions have to be fully acknowledged.

CHAPTER VII

THE MUTUAL CONTRIBUTION OF ENGLISH PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

John Locke, who has been called the wisest of Englishmen, was born in 1632, and died in 1704. There is not much known of his family, except that his father was a soldier in the Parliamentary army. This fact is significant, as it gives us an idea of the surroundings of the boy, and the early influences that would necessarily impress themselves upon his mind. During the reign of Puritanism in England, he imbibed the spirit of liberty which was characteristic of that body of men. He received his education until about fifteen years old at his Puritan home. He then spent six years at the Westminster school preparing for the university. This school was also under the control of the Puritans. In 1652, young Locke entered Christchurch College, Oxford. John Owen, a Puritan, was dean of the college, and vice-chancellor of the university. Locke took both the degrees of A. B. and A. M., and made Oxford his home much of the time for thirty years. (See the author's *Cultura*.)

Locke joined the Royal Society, but seldom attended its meetings, as his custom was to encourage small reunions of personal friends. About the year 1671, he and his friends, while discussing questions of morality and religion, came to a standstill on the limits of man's power to know the universe. When he commenced work on this question, he thought that he could solve it on one sheet of paper; but he worked on it at intervals for twenty years, and finally gave to the world his famous *Essay on the Human Understanding*. This was the greatest work of his life, and but few books have had a more powerful influence.

Locke has been called the founder of modern materialism, and the popularizer of Hobbs; but this is a great

mistake, for there are only a few points in which he agrees with Hobbs. It would be more correct to call him a follower of Bacon than a disciple of Hobbs; for he was probably the first to apply the Baconian method to psychology. Locke did not teach that sensation is the only source of knowledge; but he claimed that reflection is the second source. The following is his language: "External objects furnish the mind with ideas of sensible qualities; and the mind furnishes the understanding with the ideas of its own operations."

John Locke has been called a Rationalist; but he was not a Rationalist in the sense in which that word is generally used. He maintained that some things might be above reason, and was willing to accept them when they clearly had the authority of God. Locke was a great thinker, and could not be expected to accept religious doctrines contrary to reason. He was bitterly opposed to Mysticism in all its forms; and he certainly did lift philosophic and religious thought to a higher plane. All the religious Reformers, who opposed the Mysticism of the past two centuries, were disciples of John Locke. Even the Deists were his disciples. Dr. Joseph Priestley, the great Unitarian preacher, was a diligent student of the Lockian philosophy. He always advocated the doctrine of the Divine existence and a future state. I had the privilege of visiting the little church where he preached and his grave at Northumberland, Pennsylvania. But few Lockians ever denied the existence of God and the doctrine of a future state. The Lockian philosophy was on the side of morality and religion.

John Locke was a Christian philosopher. He was not only a believer in Christianity, but was a diligent student of the Bible. He wrote commentaries on some of its books, and was a faithful advocate of all the fundamental principles of Christianity. Locke's arguments against Atheism, and his proofs of the existence of God have been quoted by Theologians from his day to this. He says: "I think it unavoidable for every considering rational creature, that will but examine his own or any other existence, to have the notion of an eternal being who had no beginning." For his proof he appeals to the faculties of

the human mind. "We are capable of knowing certainly that there is a God, though God has given us no innate ideas of himself, though he has stamped no original characters on our minds wherein we may read his being; yet having furnished us with those faculties our minds are endowed with, he hath not left us without a witness, since we have sense, perception, reason, and cannot want a clear proof of him as long as we carry ourselves about us." (Book IV, Chap. 10, Sec. 1.) In this way he thought that he could reach the eternity of that Infinite Being who must necessarily have always existed. It was by the exercise of his faculties that he was able to clothe the Divine Being with all his perfections. The philosophy of John Locke has had a great influence on both Natural and Revealed Theology. The Deists and Unitarians have quoted him as authority as well as have the Orthodox. The Lockian Philosophy has certainly been a great support to Theology.

In England there was strong opposition to Hobbs and the materialistic school. Richard Cumberland, Bishop of Peterborough, was a very able philosopher, and successfully combated the philosophy of Hobbs. In him religion contributed to philosophy as well as philosophy to religion. Ralph Cudworth, author of the "Intellectual System," was one of the greatest scholars and thinkers of his day. He was an Armenian, and with great success opposed fatalism in both philosophy and religion. He was a disciple of Plato, and consequently Idealistic in his philosophical tendency. His "Intellectual System" has had a powerful influence on Modern Theology. Dr. Samuel Clark was also a great philosopher as well as a great theologian. His celebrated argument for the being of God as one of the necessary conceptions of the human mind was an important contribution to Modern Theology. Dr. Joseph Butler, author of the Analogies, acquired a great reputation both as philosopher and theologian by his opposition to the materialistic and atheistic tendencies of his day.

Bishop Berkley was a disciple of John Locke, and pushed one tendency of the Lockian philosophy into Idealism. Locke constantly spoke of ideas, and claimed

that they were the objects of the thinking-understanding. This seems to indicate that the object about which a man thinks is in the mind itself. Berkley was an Idealist and naturally dwelt upon those passages in Locke which seemed to favor his position. It should be said in justice to Berkley that he never denied a phenomenal world, but only rejected its materiality. He was a great thinker and has had a growing influence on science, philosophy and religion.

Herbert Spencer is the Philosopher of Evolution. He was an Evolutionist sometime before Mr. Darwin published his *Origin of the Species*. Mr. Darwin was wrong in naming Prof. Huxley as the Philosopher of Evolution. Mr. Huxley, like Tyndal and Bain, was great as a scientist, but not as a philosopher. It is true that he edited an edition of Hume, but that did not make him a philosopher. Herbert Spencer, however, is one of our greatest modern philosophers. He is pre-eminently the Philosopher of Evolution. While Evolution was advocated by even some of the Greek philosophers, it never did become the predominant philosophy until the nineteenth century. The following from Dr. Josiah Royce, of Harvard University is suggestive: "The doctrine of evolution, I assert, is in heart and essence the child of the romantic movement itself. Can the child, inheriting its mother's depth and longing for wisdom, defend this inheritance in this vast outer universe of rigid order and absolute law? That is the true problem of the philosophy of evolution. I know many who regret the tendency in our day to apply the doctrine of the transformation of species to humanity, who fear the apparently materialistic results of the discovery that the human mind has grown. For my part there lies in all this discovery of our day the deeply important presupposition that the transition from animal to man is in fact really an evolution, that is, a real history, a process having significance. If this is in truth the real interpretation of nature, then the romantic philosophy has not dreamed in vain, and the outward order of nature will embody once more the life of a divine Self."

Mr. Spencer tries to accomplish by Evolution more than there is in it. Evolution cannot account for the

ultimate cause of things; for, if true, it can be nothing more than the process by which God works. It cannot interfere with final cause, for the origin of things not only requires a cause, but an intelligent cause. Matter cannot account for its own origin, much less can it account for the origin of mind. The difference between the mind of a man and that of an oyster certainly required the Infinite to span it, whatever may have been the process by which the bridge was erected. The same thing may be said in reference to the lowest form of life and the lifeless condition of the mineral kingdom.

In his laws of the Unknowable, Mr. Spencer lays down principles which he contradicts in his Laws of the knowable. In one place he claims that the creation and destruction of matter are impossible, because inconceivable; yet in another he devotes several pages to show that inconceivability is no test of reality. If Mr. Spencer's philosophy can be used against religion, it can be used with equal force against science; for the ideas involved in religion are certainly as conceivable as those involved in science. If we deny religious knowledge on the ground of its limitation, on precisely the same ground we can deny all scientific knowledge. If religion is impossible because it involves unthinkable ideas, the same thing can be said of science. If a conception of the self-existence of God is an untenable hypothesis, then a conception of the fundamental reality, of which Mr. Spencer says so much, is also an untenable hypothesis. If a conception of the eternity of God is an untenable hypothesis, then a conception of the eternity of the fundamental reality is also an untenable hypothesis. I feel quite certain that I can use Mr. Spencer's philosophy with as much force against science as it can be used against religion.

Mr. Spencer's system of Ethics is quite deficient. He defines conduct as good which accomplishes its end. "Always, acts are called good or bad, as they are well or ill adjusted to ends." According to this view, the poison which was given to Socrates was good, for it certainly did accomplish the end for which it was given. Mr. Spencer does not make moral good a voluntary act, but simply whatever on the whole promotes pleasure. This Utili-

tarian theory here is very deficient; for a thing, to be morally good must be intended by an agent to promote happiness. Mr. Spencer says some beautiful things in reference to means to ends. He admits that beyond known phenomena there is an unknown power to produce them. In the combination of adjustments we find in the visible universe things tending to happiness; so there is evidence that the *author* of the universe is an Intelligent Being, who designed the happiness of his creatures. The moral nature of man also points back to the character of his author; and a moral law shows that there must be a moral lawgiver as the final cause of the moral universe. God is the moral lawgiver of the universe, and any system of ethics that seeks to ignore him will always prove itself a consummate failure. In his system, Mr. Spencer does not give sufficient attention to the quality of a deed, to the nature of motive, and to the character of the agent.

Mr. Spencer practically denies the freedom of the human will. This is probably his greatest mistake. In this position, he opposes the greatest psychologists and moralists of all ages, and contradicts the plainest declaration of self-consciousness. If there is anything in this world that a man does know it is his ability to act when he sees proper so to do. The effect of this theory upon morals is plain; for if a man is not a free moral agent he is not responsible for his conduct. Mr. Spencer as well as all others of his school, contradicts every day of his life the theory maintained in his philosophy. Mr. Spencer has taught much truth, and his philosophy of evolution has greatly influenced Theology; but all his followers need true Christian philosophers to declare unto them the Unknown God.

Mr. Spencer does not claim to be an atheist or materialist, and we are not disposed to call him such, whatever may be the tendency of his theory. In fact he does not claim to interfere with religion at all; but includes it in his philosophy of the Unknowable. I can see clearly how a man may be a Spencerian in philosophy, and yet be a firm believer in Christianity. Revelation may make known to us that which is unknown and even unknowable so far as philosophy is concerned. Mr. Spencer not only

claims the Unknown to be a reality, but in fact the only reality. He also argues that the known implies the unknown. In his *First Principles*, Mr. Spencer uses this language: "The belief in a Power of which no limit in time or space can be conceived, is that fundamental element in religion which survives all changes of form." As our philosopher knows the unknown to be the cause of the known, he certainly knows this much about the unknown; and this will harmonize with the philosophy of Aristotle, which teaches that things are known in their causes. We recommend to all Agnostics a careful study of the following language of Mr. Spencer: "Amid all mysteries, there remains one absolute certainty—we are ever in the presence of the infinite and eternal energy, from which all things proceed." While there is much in Mr. Spencer's philosophy that seems to point in a materialistic direction, there is also much that clearly shows that no system of materialism is sufficient to explain the phenomena of the universe. Dr. John Fiske, of Harvard University, one of the most distinguished of Mr. Spencer's disciples, in his great work entitled the *Cosmic Philosophy*, stoutly maintains that the Spencerian philosophy is in perfect harmony with Christianity. In fact, some of Mr. Spencer's disciples seem to think that his philosophy in reality is the only philosophy in perfect harmony with Christianity. It is evident that the Philosophy of Evolution has had a great influence on Theology. It is difficult now to find a leading Theologian, who is not, in some sense, an Evolutionist.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MUTUAL CONTRIBUTION OF SCOTCH PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

The Scottish Philosophy has always been very intimately related to religion. In fact, a large number of its leaders have been preachers. Its contribution to Theology has consequently been great. Dr. McCosh claims that its method is Inductive, while Buckle presents it as the very best example of the Deductive method. The fact is that it is both Inductive and Deductive. It is Inductive, so far as its great leaders have studied the human mind by the method of observation. The Scotch philosophers have strictly employed self-consciousness as the instrument of observation. They have also maintained that by the observations of consciousness principles have been found in the human mind that are prior and independent of experience. They have therefore been among the greatest leaders of what is called the Intuitional school. Some great scholars of this school have stoutly argued that the idea of God is strictly intuitive. Philosophy thus became with them the basis of Theology. Archibald Campbell, George Campbell, John Young, Thomas Chalmers and others were distinguished Theologians.

Thomas Reid

Dr. McCosh says if Thomas Reid was not the founder he was the fit representative of the Scottish philosophy. Victor Cousin, in his preface to the last edition of his work on the Scottish philosophy, maintains that Reid and not Locke has been the modern Socrates. He says in reference to Kant and Reid: "Kant has commenced the German; but he has not governed it. It early escaped him, and threw itself in very opposite directions. The

name of Kant rests only on the ruins of his doctrines. Reid has impressed on the Scottish mind a movement less grand, but this movement has had no reactions." While the language of Cousin should be taken with a good deal of allowance, it certainly shows the good common sense in the philosophy of Reid.

Dr. Reid was both a preacher and a philosopher, and he fully believed that true Theology and true Philosophy were in perfect harmony. His conviction on this subject has given us the Philosophy of Common Sense. Dr. McCosh uses the following appropriate language: "Turning now to the philosophy of Reid, we find it distinguished throughout by independence of thought and a love of truth. He admires the genius of those who were rulers in the world of speculation in his time, but he does not follow them. He might have been inclined to do so, but he was staggered by the consequences which had been drawn by Hume; and this led him to review the philosophy that prevailed in his time, and which claimed as its authors the illustrious names of Descartes, Locke, and Berkeley. The consequence is, that his works, though expository throughout, have all along a polemical front, but always bearing a calm, a polite, and benignant aspect. We cannot understand his philosophy, and we cannot appreciate his originality, unless we bear this circumstance in mind, which, I may add, we are not likely to forget, as he is constantly referring to some one or other of these authors. He claims credit in regard to two points,—one in examining and undermining the ideal theory of sense—perception, the other in establishing the doctrine of common sense."

By common sense, Reid said that he meant common judgment. He uses the following language: "We ascribe to reason two offices, or two degrees. The first is to judge of things self-evident; the second, to draw conclusions which are not self-evident from those that are. The first of these is the province and the sole province of common sense; and therefore it coincides with reason in its whole extent, and is only another name for one branch or degree of reason."

Reid's first principle that whatever begins to exist

must have a cause which produced it, was an important contribution to Theology, although Theologians even before his time had used a similar argument. Reid was a philosopher, and his argument has made a deep impression on the religious world. Also his first principle that design and intelligence in the cause may be inferred with certainty from marks or signs of it in the effect, has also had a powerful influence on Theological thought. In fact, Reid dealt a deadly blow to Humes' attack upon the idea of casuality and his effort to invalidate the truth thence derived for the existence of God. Reid stoutly denied Hume's assumption that experience is the sole foundation for our knowledge, and pointed out clearly the existence of necessary judgments beyond the bounds of experience. He clearly established the fact that cause wherever we observe an effect is one of them. Reid's contribution to Theology has consequently been great.

Dugald Stewart

Dugald Stewart was a disciple of Thomas Reid. Reid was an instructor exactly suited to young Stewart, and Stewart was the disciple to complete the philosophy of his great master. Reid had successfully combated the skepticism of Hume, and it remained for Stewart to still carry on the work to a higher degree of perfection. His lectures at the university of Edinburgh attracted very general attention, and were attended by many who afterwards became the most noted men of Great Britain. Stewart and Cousin are certainly the most noted of modern philosophers to treat ethics from the very highest of philosophical standpoints. They built up independent systems which have been very important contributions to modern Theology. Dr. McCosh says: "But the peculiar advantage arising from their method consists in this, that they have, by induction, established a body of ethical truth on grounds independent of revealed religion; and this can now be appealed to in all defences of Christianity, and as an evidence of the need of something which philosophy is incompetent to supply. Divines can now found on those great truths which the Scottish philoso-

phers have established, as to there being a distinct moral faculty and an immutable moral law, and then press on those whose conscience tells them that they have broken that law, to embrace the provision which revelation has made to meet the wants of humanity."

Sir William Hamilton

Sir William Hamilton was by far the most learned of all the Scottish philosophers. He was a disciple of Reid and Kant, and the influence of the latter has been even greater upon him than that of the former. In 1836 he became professor of philosophy in the University of Edinburgh, and rapidly developed his great system. I cannot otherwise than think that his system is more German than Scottish. He was very greatly influenced by Kant. There is quite a large number of theologians, who fully endorse Sir William Hamilton's doctrine of the relativity of all knowledge. His disciple Mansel at Oxford in his Bampton lectures still further extended the doctrine of relativity in order to undermine rationalism in both Great Britain and Germany. He carried it so far that he went into the theory of nescience, and in his efforts to exalt faith undermined both faith and reason.

Dr. McCosh thus speaks of this doctrine of relativity: "I acknowledge, first, that things are known to us only so far as we have the capacity to know them; in this sense, indeed, even the divine knowledge is relative. I acknowledge, secondly, that we do not know all things; nay, that we do not know all about any one thing. Herein human knowledge differs from the divine: but the word relative is not the phrase to attach to human knowledge; in order to point out the difference, it would be better to say that man's knowledge is partial or finite as distinguished from perfect or absolute. I may admit, thirdly, that man discovers external objects under a relation to himself and his cognitive mind. So much, then, I freely allow. But, on the other hand, I demur, first, to the statement that we do not know existence in itself, or, as he expresses it elsewhere in Kantian phraseology, that we do not know the thing in itself (*Ding an sich*). I do not like the

language: it is ambiguous. I doubt whether there is such a thing as existence in itself; and, of course, what does not exist cannot be known. If he means to say that we do not know things as existing, I deny the statement. Everything we know, we know as existing; not only so, but we know the thing itself,—not all about the thing, but so much of the very thing itself.”

The theory of nescience is the opposite extreme to the theory of omniscience. In a somewhat careful study of the History of Theology, the author has found nearly all modern theologians greatly dependent upon the one theory or the other. The one class would exalt faith at the expense of reason, and the other would substitute reason in the place of divine revelation.

Thomas Chalmers

Thomas Chalmers was both Theologian and Philosopher, and probably the greatest preacher Scotland ever produced. His influence upon Scottish thought was consequently very great. In 1815-16, the year of the battle of Waterloo, he delivered his “Astronomical Discourses,” which drew immense audiences in Glasgow, and were read by thinkers in all parts of the world. These discourses were both philosophical and theological. In his “Mercantile Discourses,” he applied moral philosophy to business, and showed how these principles would promote healthy trade. In 1823, Dr. Chalmers became professor of moral philosophy in the University of St. Andrews, and his influence upon the young men of that institution was very great. He sent out many who were thoroughly in sympathy with his high moral principles, and they became great leaders in the progress of society, not only in Scotland, but also in other portions of the British Empire and in America. In 1827, he was chosen professor of theology in the University of Edinburgh, which was probably the highest position that Scotland had to offer to any man. Dr. Chalmers was a special student in natural theology, and this was especially attractive to the young men of Edinburgh. They greatly enjoyed his analogies between natural and revealed religion.

In the following respects, the Scottish philosophy has influenced modern theology: (1) It applied the inductive method to the study of the human mind, and this same method was to a very great extent employed by theologians, who had been influenced by the Scottish philosophy. (2) The Scottish philosophy has influenced Theology in its doctrine of intuition. It has clearly shown that inward intuition or perception gives us as direct knowledge of the human soul as outward perception gives us a knowledge of the material world. The following language of J. D. Morell is worthy of careful thought: "The powers of nature are dependent, relative, and finite; they all point us, therefore, to a self-existent unity of power, from which they sprang. The power of mind, as an intelligent cause, or personality, is relative and finite also; and this points to an infinite and absolute personality. Combine the notions of the unity of all power as seen in nature, and a perfect type of all personality as seen in man, and we have the conception of a God. Of God as the infinite, the absolute, accordingly we have a direct apperception. The light of primitive truth falls immediately upon the eye of the soul. Had we to reason ourselves into the existence of the material world, and were we to define perception as the act of the mind in conducting this reasoning to its result, we should never find our way out of the subjective circle. Perception, however, is the direct gazing upon the world without, by the medium of its immediate *action* upon ourselves, and here, in this *spontaneous* reception of truth, we find *the objectively real*. Exactly in the same manner, had we to reason up to the absolute, all we could do would be to personify our ideas; but pure reason, like pure perception, receives objective truth spontaneously; it gazes upon its object with an immediacy which suffers no error or doubt to intervene, and gives us in this way a guarantee for its legitimacy, which it is impossible to resist." While we do not fully endorse the above, there is certainly much truth in it; and we hope the reader will ponder it carefully. (3) The Scottish Intuitional philosophy has had an important influence upon Christian Ethics. I fully believe that both the Intuitional and Utilitarian schools have made

important contributions to Christian Ethics; and that a true Golden Mean philosophy must recognize the contributions from both sources. True Philosophy and Theology must prove all things and hold fast to the good.

CHAPTER IX

THE MUTUAL CONTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

American philosophy has been very intimately connected with its Theology. In fact, nearly all American philosophers have been theologians also. While it would hardly be proper to speak of a distinct school of American philosophy, America has put its stamp upon the European schools imported to this country. We have had the French, the German, the English, and the Scotch waves strike our shores.

French Philosophy in America

President R. Graham, one of my teachers in Kentucky University, was a disciple of Descartes. On his death-bed he spoke of the philosophy of this distinguished Frenchman, and claimed that it came nearer representing a true philosophy than that of any other author with which he was acquainted. President Graham had a great influence on the theological students of that classic institution, and consequently many of them were influenced by the philosophy of their learned president.

President Burgess, of the University of Indianapolis was an Eclectic in philosophy, and he was greatly influenced by the system of the great Frenchman, Cousin. I was also a student of philosophy under President Burgess, and I know that his influence upon theological students was very great.

On a visit to Princeton University several years ago, I had the privilege of hearing lecture, Dr. Charles Woodruff Shields. I then obtained a copy of his work entitled, "The Final Philosophy," and have studied it with a great deal of care. I would call Dr. Shields an Eclectic

in Philosophy, and he has doubtlessly studied carefully French Eclectism. He employs his philosophy as a means of harmonizing Science and Religion. He really makes philosophy the umpire between science and religion.

The following language taken from the Final Philosophy is worthy of careful thought: "When we have excluded what is purely scientific teaching on the one side and merely religious teaching on the other, there remains to be formed a midway course, which will include only what they have in common; being partly scientific and partly religious and therefore, properly speaking, a philosophical department of instruction. Within such limits, it would seem to be the province of the chair to teach both religion and science so far as they are logically connected; to inculcate their mutual relations as joint interests of truth; to define their boundaries and laws as neighboring domains of research; and to exhibit their contents and results as one harmonious body of knowledge. They are thus brought together in the very title of the professorship; and to treat them otherwise, to pursue them as conflicting branches of learning or array them as antagonists on the field of inquiry, would be both unphilosophical and perilous. It would be unphilosophical, because it would mar and sunder vast portions of truth which logically require each other and which, as lovers of truth, we should seek to combine together in their integrity and consistency; and it would be perilous, since it would only tend in its moral effects either towards superstition or towards bigotry, according as we became mere partisans of one interest against the other." On account of his position as professor of the harmony between science and religion at one of our greatest American universities his contribution to both philosophy and theology has been extensive. Besides Dr. Shields has made a reputation both as a philosopher and theologian.

German Philosophy in America

Dr. Noah Porter is the best American representative of German Orthodox philosophy. I had the privilege of attending his recitations and lectures at Yale University.

Dr. Joseph Cook claimed that he could think in German as could no other American scholar. Dr. Porter was a theologian as well as philosopher, and consequently his influence on American Theology has been great. In his great work entitled, "The Human Intellect" he thus applies the doctrine of design or final cause to Theology: "In Theology, or the science of God, whether natural or revealed, this principle is of supreme importance. The most of the so-called demonstrations of the being of God, find their material or grounds of proof in the indications of design that are furnished in the material and spiritual universe. These arguments are usually stated somewhat thus: Design proves or implies a designer; The universe abounds in design; Therefore the universe implies or proves a designer. Or order and adaptation imply a designer; The Universe abounds in order and adaptation; Therefore a designer exists. The major premise of this argument is obviously assumed or received as a priori. The minor is a statement of fact grounded on observation or induction. Those who employ it would not accept the view for which we contend, that the belief that adaptation prevails throughout the universe is a first truth or axiom of thought. They rest their belief upon observation, and they search through the universe to discover instances of the presence of this relation. Having observed a sufficient number, they gather them into a result by induction, and then apply the proposition which expresses them as the minor premise of their syllogism. We have sought to prove that the proposition affirming final cause is a first principle or intuitive truth; that it is not in any sense dependent on observation, but is an original and necessary belief or category; that so far from being derived from induction, it is the necessary ground itself on which induction itself must rest for its validity and application."

Dr. William T. Harris, U. S. Commissioner of Education, is probably the best representative in America of the Hegelian school of philosophy. While Dr. Harris is quite liberal in religion, he is a firm believer in the existence of God and a future state. I have recently read his interesting work on Hegel's Logic, and I think he shows quite

conclusively that Hegel himself believed in the fundamental verities of religion. The following on Casuality will be read with interest: "The cause is conceived as active and only as active. Its action produces an effect on something else. It sends a stream of influence to an effect. This involves the idea of self-separation. For the cause separates this influence and transmits it of its own energy, and not because impelled to do this by some alien energy or cause. That alien energy which impelled the transmission would in that case be the true cause. But the true cause would still be that which separated from itself and transmitted to another some influence which worked a modification in that other and thus caused an effect. The cause by itself in the act of self-separation is and must be a self-activity—that which determines itself. Hence *causa sui* is the nucleus of each and every causal act." Again on page 401 of his work on 'Hegel's Logic,' Dr. Harris says: "The idea being once comprehended as the higher unity of intellect and will (in this Hegel and Aquinas agree), it follows that it is perfect subject and perfect object and complete personality in each. The First knows himself in the Second; this is not nature even as totality. But the Second knowing himself as derived creates a world of becoming and derivative being which uses from space and time through matter up to organic beings and finally to man. Man has his forms of emancipation from externality and these culminate in philosophy and theology in an insight into the nature of God."

I have recently read a very interesting volume on "The Spirit of Modern Philosophy," by Dr. Josiah Royce, of Harvard University. Dr. Royce is a special student of German philosophy and a disciple of the Hegelian school. He is a believer in God and a future state, and I am inclined to think that his philosophy is destined to wield considerable influence upon American Theological thought. The key-note to Dr. Royce's Philosophy is the following: "There is nothing in the universe absolutely sure except the Infinite."

English Philosophy in America

English philosophy has had great influence on American Theology. This has been especially true of the philosophy of John Locke. One of the best representatives of the Lockian philosophy in this country was Dr. W. D. Wilson, of Cornell University. I had the privilege of hearing him lecture at this noted institution, and was impressed with his thoughtful devotion to the philosophy of Locke. A few years ago I met him again at the American Institute of Christian Philosophy, and found there that he had not lost any of his zeal for the great English philosopher. He published an excellent work on "The Foundations of Religious Belief," and in this work he has ably defended Natural Theology from the standpoint of the Lockian Philosophy.

John Fiske, of Harvard University, was doubtless the greatest student of the Philosophy of Herbert Spencer that America has produced. I spent four months at Harvard when he was librarian of the university. I have read nearly all the works written by Professor Fiske, and I have read his *Cosmic Philosophy* through twice. I was anxious to decide for my own satisfaction, if it was possible for a man to be a disciple of Herbert Spencer, and at the same time be a Christian. So great a man as was John Fiske was both, and I reached the conclusion that it was possible for others to be the same thing. While I regarded the theories of Spencer as an extreme, still there was room left for a revelation from God. In fact, John Fiske claimed that Mr. Spencer meant by his "Unknowable" about the same thing that Moses meant when he said that the ways of God were past finding out. The Philosophy of Herbert Spencer has had a great influence in America in what is known as "The New Theology."

Scotch Philosophy in America

The greatest representative of the Scotch Philosophy in America was Dr. James McCosh, of Princeton University. He was called from Scotland to the presidency of

Princeton University, one of the oldest and most noted of American colleges, and his influence on American Theology has probably been as great as that of any other philosopher. I had the privilege of knowing Dr. McCosh quite well at Princeton and conversing with him on Reid, Hamilton and other distinguished Scotch philosophers. He was by nature an earnest man, but that was a subject upon which he would become intense. He was a thorough advocate of the Scotch Intuitional School. While this is true, he did not hesitate to criticise the Scotch school when he thought it in the wrong. I have read nearly everything Dr. McCosh ever wrote. The following will be suggestive to every thoughtful reader: "The idea of God, the belief in God, may be justly represented as native to man. He is led to it by the circumstances in which he is placed calling into energy mental principles which are natural to all. He does not require to go in search of it; it comes to him. He has only to be waiting for it and disposed to receive it, and it will be pressed on him from every quarter; it springs up naturally, as the plant or animal does from the germ; it will well up spontaneously from the depths of the heart; or it will shine on him from the works of nature, as light does from the sun." Again Dr. McCosh says: "I am not convinced that we are obliged to call in a separate intuition to discover and guarantee the Divine existence. I agree, with the majority of philosophers and divines of all ages, that the common intelligence, combined with our moral perceptions and an obvious experience leads to a belief in God and his chief attributes. But in the process there may be, and there commonly is, a variety of elements conspiring. In particular, there are both experiential and *a priori* elements."

The above extracts are taken from "The Intuitions of the Mind," which I consider Dr. McCosh's greatest book. In fact, he told me at Princeton that he considered it his best work. It should be carefully studied by every Philosopher as well as Theologian; and while I believe it to be extreme on some points, it will tend to counteract opposite extremes.

Pragmatism really had an American origin. Mr. C.

S. Pierce, in 1878, published an article in the *Popular Science Monthly*, entitled "How To Make Our Ideas Clear." He used the Greek word *Pragma*, which means action. It proved an epoch-making article, for the new philosophy adopted it. In 1896, Prof. William James, of Harvard University, published "His Will To Believe." I read it soon after its publication, and was much interested in it. Its influence has been great, especially among scientists, and it prepared the way for his work entitled "Pragmatism." I have read this book twice. This philosophy appears to be largely based upon Kant's *Practical Reason*, and Karl Pearson's *Grammar of Science*. It contains much truth, but goes to extremes in the line of Utilitarianism. Prof. Dewey, of Columbia University, and Prof. Schiller, of Oxford University (England), take more extreme positions than does Prof. James. Pragmatism is destined to greatly influence European as well as American thought.

CHAPTER X

THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY UPON MARTIN LUTHER'S THEOLOGY

Martin Luther, the great German reformer, was born at Eisleben, Saxony, November 10, 1483, and died at the same place, February 18, 1546. His father was a poor peasant, but had, by frugality and industry, acquired before his death a respectable living for his family. In the son were combined the characteristics of both Northern and Southern Germany. He possessed the valor of the North and the gentleness of the South. Martin never forgot his humble origin, and was always proud to say that he was the son of a peasant. The discipline of the family was probably too severe. Luther says that it made him timid and caused him to become a monk. The rod may spoil the child by improper using as well as neglect.

Although the parents of Luther were poor, they determined to educate their son and prepare him for the law. In 1497, he was sent to Magdeburg, to prepare for the university. His father not being able to bear the expense there, removed him to Eisenach, where he could live with relatives and attend school at a much less expense. The German schools at that time were extremely rigid, and Luther came under the severest discipline. For several years he had to support himself in school by singing songs in the neighboring villages. At times he almost despaired of ever being able to finish his education; but the very trials he underwent were the very means in the hands of God preparing him for his great work.

When young Luther was driven from place to place in very great want, a wealthy woman who was charmed with his music, furnished him with the means to complete his education. Her name was Ursula Cotta, and it should

be written in letters of gold. His father was also able to render him some assistance; so he entered the university of Erfurt in 1501, and graduated with the degree of M. A. in 1505. He had taken a thorough course, and knew as much about Scholasticism as any man of his age. We will hereafter see that the Scholastic philosophy had a powerful influence upon his Theology.

At the completion of his education, the father insisted that the son in whom he had taken so much pride should be a lawyer; but certain things took place, which young Luther considered providential, and he determined to devote his time to the service of God. So, in July 1505, he entered the Augustinian convent at Erfurt. Here he became acquainted with German Mysticism, and read with the greatest delight the sermons of Tauler. We will see hereafter that this philosophy had a great influence upon his mystical theory of conversion. He also found a Bible, and studied it with much interest. The book of Romans and the epistle to the Galatians were his favorites books.

In 1508, he was recommended to Frederick, the Wise, as the most suitable man to occupy the chair of Scholastic philosophy at the university, which Frederick had recently established at Wittenberg. He lectured on Aristotle, and, also gave Bible lectures. His lectures were largely attended, especially those on the Bible. He was also persuaded to preach, and his eloquence attracted large audiences.

As we will see later, Luther's philosophic training tended to the rejection of Papal infallibility. His visit to Rome in 1511 enables him to clearly see the corrupt tendencies of the Papacy. He had no idea at that time of breaking with it. He returned to the University of Wittenberg, and received the degree of Doctor of Divinity, D. D., meant more then than it does now. He continued his lectures at the University, and rapidly developed the principles of the Reformation.

In 1517, Luther nailed ninety-five theses against indulgences to the door of the Schlosskirche of Wittenberg. This brought upon him the wrath of Leo X; but the Pope was afraid of causing trouble in Germany, and had to

move cautiously against the rebellious monk. The Elector of Saxony was Luther's friend, and neither the Pope nor the Emperor wanted to offend him. Finally Luther was summoned to the Diet of Worms, and appeared before that august body in 1521. As he would not recant he was pronounced an avowed heretic. The papal party was anxious to deal with him as Huss had been dealt with one century before; but Frederick, the Wise, and the Germans determined to defend the great reformer.

The Reformation grew rapidly, and the Pope and the Emperor decided to put it down by force; so a great Catholic League was formed. A Diet at Augsburg was called to see if reconciliation was possible, but things had gone too far. The Reformation could not be checked. It was at this Diet that the Augsburg Confession was drawn up by Melancthon, and was adopted by the Protestant party in Germany. Soon the Protestant *princes* formed an alliance which gave unity to the Protestant defense against the Papacy. (See the Author's *Struggles and Triumphs of the Truth*.)

The Influence of Scholasticism upon Luther's Theology

The influence of Scholasticism on Luther's Theology was great. Luther had been a great student of Scholasticism, and this system of philosophy had a powerful influence on his theology. A careful study of his life shows the influence of Scholasticism on nearly all his peculiar positions. He had been a great student of William Occam, and frequently employed the dialectics of this master in combating the positions of his opponents.

William Occam was an English schoolman of the fourteenth century. He was a student of the celebrated Scotus, but became even a rival to his great master. He became a member of the Franciscan order, and in 1322 headed the revolt of this order against Pope John XXII. For the part he took in this revolt he was imprisoned in the papal palace at Avignon nearly two years. Having escaped from his dungeon he went to Bavaria, where he assisted the ruler of that country in a revolt against Papal authority. He said to Louis of Bavaria, "Defend me

with your sword, and I will defend you with my pen." He and his associates wrote many books and pamphlets against the arrogant pretensions of the Papal see. It is not difficult to see that Occam powerfully influenced Luther's position in reference to the infallibility of the Pope. Occam had truly dealt strong blows against Papal claims.

Occam was opposed to the position of the realists on the doctrine of Transubstantiation. While he believed in the divine presence in the Lord's supper, he did not believe that the bread was the literal body and the wine the literal blood of Christ. His theory was called Consubstantiation. Luther adopted his theory almost verbatim. In his discussion with Zwingli, Luther showed the influence of Occam, and defended his position with the weapons of philosophy which he had drawn from Occam.

Dr. George P. Fisher, of Yale, thus speaks of this controversy: "The vehemence of Luther's hostility to the Zwinglian doctrine is manifest in his correspondence for a considerable period after the rise of the controversy. There were no terms of opprobrium too violent for him to apply to the tenet and persons of the Sacramentarians."

Again Dr. Fisher says: "Of course, the most urgent exertions would be made to heal a schism that threatened to breed great disasters to the Protestant cause. Not only was it a scandal of which the Roman Catholic party would only be too happy to make an abundant use, but it distracted the counsels and tended to paralyze the physical strength of the Protestant interest. The theologian, who was most industrious in the work of bringing about a union, was Martin Bucer, who from his position at Strasburg was well situated in reference to both of the contending parties, and who was uncommonly ingenious in framing compromises, or at devising formulas sufficiently ambiguous to cover dissonant opinions. Rude and violent though Luther sometimes was, he was always utterly honest and outspoken, and for this reason proved on some occasions unmanageable; and Zwingli, earnest as was his desire for peace, was too sincere and self-respecting to hide his opinion under equivocal phraseology. At least, when he was openly attacked, he would openly

stand for its defense. Of the princes who were active in efforts to pacify the opposing schools and bring them upon some common ground, Philip, the Landgrave of Hesse, was most conspicuous. The most memorable attempt of this sort was the Conference at Marburg in 1529, where the Swiss theologians met Luther and Melancthon. The former accommodated themselves to the view of the Lutherans on the subject of original sin, and on some other points respecting which their orthodoxy had been questioned. The only point of difference was the Eucharist; but here the difference proved irreconcilable."

This shows how powerfully the philosophy of Occam continued to influence Luther's theology. He could not overcome his scholastic tendencies. When he and his Saxon associates sat on one side of the table and the Swiss theologians sat on the opposite side, he wrote upon the table with chalk in Latin,—“hoc est meum corpus,” and insisted upon the literal sense of the language. Of course, no agreement could be reached. When Zwingle, with tears in his eyes, offered his hand to Luther, the great German refused it; not wishing it to be understood that he and Zwingle belonged to the same communion.

The Influence of Mysticism on Luther's Theology

Cousin gives Mysticism as one of the four systems of philosophy to which the human mind tends. This as well as other systems has had its counterpart in theology. In the history of both philosophy and theology we find that Mysticism has always played its part. It like other systems contains much truth; but it has frequently gone to great extremes, and has led to error. In India both Brahmanism and Buddhism tend to Mysticism. In the Platonic philosophy there is a mystical element; and Plotinus and the Neoplatonists were the greatest mystics of any age. This philosophy powerfully affected some of the leading Scholastics, and through them has influenced modern philosophy and theology.

Mysticism became a leading system in both theology and philosophy in Germany; and it exerted a very great influence upon the theology of Martin Luther. Meister

Eckhart, the founder of German Mysticism, lived during the last part of the thirteenth and the early part of the fourteenth century. He was a Dominican and for a time taught in one of the colleges of Paris. He was one of the greatest preachers of his day, and was especially noted for the interest he took in all reform movements. He spent a number of years in Strasburg, and completed his system of philosophy and theology that had such a great influence in Germany. He was finally summoned before the inquisition at Cologne. His death occurred soon after this, and a portion of his writings were condemned by the Pope. His system of Mysticism was largely drawn from the Neoplatonists. Tauler was his most noted disciple, and Tauler's influence upon the Theology of Martin Luther was certainly very great.

Johann Tauler flourished during the first six decades of the fourteenth century. It is said that he entered the Dominican convent of Strasburg, his native town, when Meister Eckhart was professor of theology. He made rapid progress and became the most noted disciple of this celebrated philosopher and theologian. The sermons of Tauler are said to be the very finest in the German language and it is not surprising that they so much interested Luther. In 1516 Luther published the *Deutsche Theologie*, of which Tauler was certainly one of the authors. Luther wrote a preface to it, and declared the book the very greatest except the Bible and Augustine. On the question of Justification, Tauler went beyond Eckhart. The founder of German mysticism taught that faith involved both reason and will, and that works were also efficacious. Tauler taught that justification is by faith only and that works are inefficacious. Luther and his associates adopted the theory of Tauler. Luther went to so great an extreme as to reject the Epistle of James.

CHAPTER XI

THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY UPON SWEDENBORG'S THEOLOGY

Emanuel Swedenborg, a Swedish theologian and philosopher, was born in Stockholm, January 29, 1688, and died in London, England, March 29, 1772. He completed his university course at Upsal, in 1709. After two years' travel in Holland, France and England, he settled at Griefswold in Pomerania, where he spent his time in scientific study and research. He was a great student, a fine scholar, and a man of universal culture. It was hard for him to confine his exclusive attention to any one department of study, for he was a master in all departments. While engaged in scientific research, he wrote Latin fables and Latin poems. His versatility was such that he could compose in a number of languages with almost equal accuracy. Beginning in 1716, he published for two years a periodical devoted to mathematics and mechanics. We next find him in the service of Charles XII, of Sweden, as chief engineer in the college of mines. He maintained close personal relations to the king, and greatly assisted in military operations. At the suggestion of the king, an eminent Swedish scientist offered his daughter in marriage to Swedenborg; but as the young lady preferred another he relinquished his claims and never got married. It placed the mind of Swedenborg in rather an abnormal condition on the question of marriage.

He spent his time from 1717 to 1722 in writing on scientific subjects, and among his writings at this time was a pamphlet on a method of determining longitude by means of the moon. While there was valuable information in this pamphlet, there was a good deal that was only moonshine; and many think that Swedenborg was pretty thoroughly moon-struck. About this time his extreme

mystical tendency of mind began to manifest itself. He took another rest in travel, and become acquainted with many of the most distinguished scientists of his day. His scientific reputation became thoroughly established; and he became a member of the Academy of Science at Stockholm, and corresponding member of the Imperial Academy of Science at St. Petersburg, and member of the Academy of Science at Upsal. In 1745, his scientific writings closed in a work entitled, "De Cultu et Amore Dei," in which he set forth, under the form of an allegory, his theory on the creation of the world.

In 1746, Swedenborg believed that he was called to reveal a new system of religion to man. He wrote many works. Some think he was insane; but his disciples actually believe that he had the revelations which he claimed. He states that his spiritual condition came upon him gradually, and did not at all alarm him, although it greatly excited him. I believe that Swedenborg was thoroughly honest; but I have no doubt about his mind having been in an abnormal condition. He made no efforts to gain proselytes to his doctrine, except the publication and distribution of his writings. When upon the death-bed he was asked concerning his teachings, he said: "As true as you see me before you, so true is everything I have written." In a few days he died, in great peace of mind, having partaken of the Lord's Supper a short time before.

See the author's Struggles and Triumphs of the Truth.

Swedenborg's Philosophy

In philosophy he was a disciple of Descartes and Spinoza. He was a great lover of Descartes, and spoke most beautifully of the great French metaphysician, even until his death. Descartes was really the founder of the ideal philosophy of modern times. When one man follows a certain tendency which he admires in another, he is most certain in that tendency to go far beyond his master. Swedenborg, therefore, represents the extreme mysticism of the Cartesian philosophy. He was a formidable opponent of German infidelity, and an advocate of super-

naturalism. In philosophy we may associate him with Lavater, Heinrich and Stilling. We may call these men theosophic mystics, if we do not go so far as to call them visionaries. This tendency was manifested to some extent with Zinzendorf and the Pietists. We will see hereafter that John Wesley, who was a disciple of Zinzendorf, impressed its image upon modern Methodism. This mystic tendency was fearfully visible in the early history of Methodist revivalism.

Zinzendorf did not, however, claim to have revelations, nor did he believe that any newer revelation could supercede the Bible. In this he differed from Swedenborg, who insisted upon continued revelations, a power to communicate with the spiritual world, and also the power to work miracles. There is an intimate relation between Swedenborgianism and modern spiritualism. Neither system openly rejects the Bible, but both largely supercede it by their claims to new revelations. It is fair, however, to state that although Swedenborg was a spiritualist, he manifested much more reverence for the Bible than do the majority of Spiritualists. Swedenborg was a good man, but was so imaginative that his visions became to him realities.

Swedenborg's Theology

It is difficult to give a sketch of Swedenborg's doctrine, as the outer and inner appear to conflict; and the threads, which bind the whole, are in knots, while their loose ends are lost in a mystical cloud. He may have seen the logical connections of his different positions, but it is not for man now on earth to see them. The Scriptures were not the only source from which Swedenborg derived religious truth, especially the Scriptures according to the letter. The angels, he asserted, *i. e.* the spirits of the departed, were his instructors; for he recognized no other angels than these. The teachings of these celestial beings he did not think antagonistic to the Bible, but supplementary. "Indeed," said he, "the angels help me to rightly understand the Bible."

Swedenborg opposed the doctrine of the Trinity. Ac-

According to revelations made by the angels to him, he says there are not three persons, as the orthodox maintain, which is but saying there are three *gods*; but the whole Trinity is embraced in a single person of the Godman, Jesus Christ. According to this, when Christ was upon the earth, there was no God in the heavens. Swedenborg wrote some good things about Tri-theism; but his position contradicts some of the plainest statements in the Bible in reference to Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Just as certainly as the unity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit in one nature, which is evidently taught in the Bible, contradicts Tri-theism just so certainly does the difference in personality, or subsistence, between Father, Son and Holy Spirit contradict the Swedenborgian doctrine of unity.

Swedenborg's views of life after death are highly interesting. He affirmed that every person transfers his mundane life unchanged to the other world. What he was and did here, he will be and do there; what he wished and worked for here, he will desire and work for there. He regards the future life as only a high potentiality of the present life. With this before us, it is not difficult to understand his teaching in reference to future marriage, houses and lots, farms, sheep and cattle. While Swedenborg was a great extremist, he made important contributions to science, philosophy, and theology. Any student of Henry Drummond can readily see that he was greatly indebted to the philosophy of Swedenborg for important suggestions in his great work, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. Dr. A. Wilford Hall told me in his office in New York that he had received more important suggestions from Swedenborg than from any other man in formulating his Substantial Philosophy. While Dr. Hall only believed a few things taught by this German mystic, still he thought Swedenborg one of the greatest thinkers in the world. Swedenborgianism has had a wide-spread influence upon the whole Protestant world, especially upon the great Lutheran family.

CHAPTER XII

THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY UPON JOHN CALVIN'S THEOLOGY

John Calvin, one of the greatest of reformers, was born at Noyon, in Northern France, in 1509, and died at Geneva, in 1594. His father was an industrious man, and became a notary in an ecclesiastical court. His mother was a pious woman, and much devoted to her family. While high political positions could be attained to only by certain families, any position in the church was open to the son of the poorest peasant. The father of Calvin felt that his son might occupy even the papal chair. The early inclinations of young Calvin caused his father to educate him for the priesthood. At an early age he was placed in the household of the noble family of De Mortmor, where he received an early education with the children of the house. He soon became noted for a studious disposition and great memory. He loved solitude, and when he was with other students he found so much fault that Guizot says he was called *The Accusative Case*.

When the plague broke out at Noyon, and the young De Mortmors went to Paris to finish their education, young Calvin went along with them. He entered the College de la Marche, at that time under the regency of the noted Maturin Cordier, a man of fine education, liberal spirit, and an energetic teacher. Calvin claims that this man laid the foundation of his future success.

See the author's *Struggles and Triumphs of the Truth*.

1. The Scholastic philosophy had a great influence upon the Life as well as the Theology of John Calvin. When he was a student at the College Montaign, he came under the instruction and influence of a celebrated Spanish philosopher by whom he was taught the Scholastic philosophy, and he showed that philosophic ability, which was

afterwards so manifest in his writings. By over study he also laid the foundation of a disease which finally brought him to a premature grave.

Calvin's system of Theology is largely built upon the writings of Augustine, who was the greatest of the Scholastic theologians. While Calvin in many points went far beyond Augustine, his writings clearly manifest the fact that Augustine was his master. There is scarcely an important doctrine discussed by Calvin that Augustine had not discussed before him, and the mind of the great Scholastic was better balanced than the author of Calvinism. While Calvin was a great thinker and a great writer, he was always disposed to go to extremes. This is certainly a very weak element in the make-up of this distinguished man.

Dr. John Lord thus speaks of Augustine in his relation to Calvin and other great leaders: "He furnished a thesaurus not merely to Bernard and Thomas Aquinas, but even to Calvin and Bossuet and Pascal. And it will be the marvelous lucidity of the Bishop of Hippo which shall bring back to the true faith, if it is ever brought back, that part of the Roman Catholic Church which accepts the verdict of the Council of Trent, when that famous council indorsed the opinions of Pelagius while upholding the authority of Augustine as the greatest doctor of the church." Dr. Lord calls him the precursor of Bernard, of Leibnitz, of Calvin, of Bossuet, all of whom reproduced his ideas, and acknowledged him as the fountain of their own greatness.

2. Stoicism had a great influence upon the Theology of John Calvin. Melancthon regarded Calvin as a Stoic. Notwithstanding their friendship, this great German scholar could not be induced to endorse Calvin's doctrine of predestination. He maintained that Calvin taught the Stoic doctrine of fate. When Bolsec was arrested for attacking this doctrine, Melancthon wrote a friend that a man had been imprisoned in Geneva for not agreeing with Zeno. Calvin was fond of the Roman Stoics, and when a young man published an edition of Seneca's *De Clementia*, with an extended commentary.

When I first read the life of Marcus Aurelius, the great

Stoic emperor, and saw his beautiful character, I could not understand how he could persecute the Christians as he did. He was one of the best of emperors and one of the worst of persecutors. Much the same thing can be said of Calvin. He had no toleration whatever for a man who did not believe his theology. Dr. John Lord in his *Beacon Lights of History*, says: "He (Calvin) was not one of those thinkers who sympathized with liberty of conscience. He persecuted heretics like a mediaeval Catholic divine. He would have burned a Galileo as he caused the death of Servetus, which need not have happened but for him. Calvin could have saved Servetus if he had pleased; but he complained of him to the magistrates, knowing that his condemnation and death would necessarily follow. He had neither the humanity of Luther nor the toleration of Saint Augustine."

Guizot presents a view more favorable to Calvin: "It was their tragical destiny to enter into mortal combat as the champions of two great causes. It is my profound conviction that Calvin's cause was the good one; that it was the cause of morality, of social order, of civilization. Servetus was the representative of a system false in itself, superficial under the pretense of science, and destructive alike of social dignity in the individual, and of moral order in human society. In their disastrous encounter, Calvin was conscientiously faithful to what he believed to be truth and duty; but he was hard, much more influenced by violent animosity than he imagined, and devoid alike of sympathy and generosity. Servetus was sincere and resolute in his conviction, but he was frivolous, presumptuous, vain, and an envious man, capable, in time of need, of resorting to artifice and untruth. Servetus obtained the honor of being one of the few martyrs to intellectual liberty; whilst Calvin, who was one of those who undoubtedly did most towards the establishment of religious liberty, had the misfortune to ignore his adversary's right to liberty of belief."

While Calvin's crime was largely the crime of his age; still we cannot justify a man of his intelligence in putting to death a man, because he could not accept the Geneva theology. Calvin's views were doubtless more correct

than the views of Servetus; but still I am inclined to think that both were great extremes.

Calvin's conduct towards Castellio is another evidence of his intolerant spirit. Castellio was a great scholar, whom Calvin brought from Strasburg to Geneva. He wished to be ordained to the ministry; but Calvin objected because the man entertained some peculiar views in reference to the Song of Solomon. Calvin and his friends so persecuted the man until, it is said, he literally starved to death. Such was the stern fatalism of the great Geneva reformer.

3. The Influence of Humanism upon Calvin's theology.

When a student at the College de la Marche, in Paris, he studied Latin under Corderius, a celebrated Humanist, and became one of the finest Latin scholars in Europe. He was through life greatly attached to this teacher, and placed him at the head of his college in Geneva. Humanism had such a powerful influence upon John Calvin that he wanted to devote his life to study, and it was only through the powerful personality of Farel that he was induced to undertake the work in Geneva.

Calvin's influence upon education was great. The Dutch were Calvinists, and they were among the most distinguished educators in Europe. They even founded a great university in the midst of their struggle with Spain. The Scotch have been noted for their devotion to Calvinistic theology, and they are probably the finest educated people in the world. The Puritans were Calvinists, and were noted for their leadership in education. Sixteen years after landing on the barren coast of New England they founded Harvard College. In 1700, Yale College was likewise founded by disciples of John Calvin.

4. The Influence of Roman Law upon the Theology of John Calvin.

The father of John Calvin at first intended his son for the priesthood; but finally changed his mind, and concluded that the law would be a more lucrative profession. Young Calvin pursued his legal studies at Orleans and Bourges. He attained very high distinction in the study of the law, and was even called on for his advice in reference to the divorce of Henry VIII. He had a legal mind,

and was especially gifted in what we might call the Philosophy of Law. He carried his legal methods into his theology. His "Institutes" bear the impress of a lawyer, and especially one thoroughly versed in Roman law. While at Strasburg he published his Commentary on the Epistle of the Romans, and it is not surprising that this was his favorite epistle; for it is itself really a legal document. Its purpose, however, is to show that there is something higher than law. Dr. Fisher, of Yale, says: "He was possessed of an exegetical tact which few have equalled. He had the true spirit of a scholar. He detests irrelevant talk about a passage, but unfolds its meaning in concise and pointed terms."

It is certain that Calvin's legal studies greatly influenced the legislation of Geneva. There is much more of the Old Testament in it than the New. The Hebrew Theocracy was to him the supreme model. Those who would not conform to it he was ready to persecute even to death. He was conscientious even in filling the prisons with victims for the executioner.

It is evident that Calvin's philosophical and legal studies had a powerful influence upon his whole system of theology. His theology has had a wide-spread influence, and is largely endorsed by the Independents and Baptists as well as by the Presbyterians. The following are its chief points: Man is by nature guilty and corrupt. The first man was created pure, but fell, and was damned with all his posterity. The human race thus became totally depraved, and all men were obnoxious to God. Even infants are under this condemnation. The natural state of man is hateful to God, and the only remedy is in Christ. The believer is saved by faith in Christ; but this faith is the direct gift of God. Calvin placed faith before repentance. He taught that God had, from eternity, foreordained a portion of the human race to eternal life, and another portion to eternal damnation. He denied the freedom of the will, so far as man's choice has anything to do with his destiny. Such is the stern fatalism of Calvinism; and I believe that it has driven many into skepticism.

Dr. John Lord truly says: "Almost any system of

belief can be logically deduced from Scripture texts. It should be the work of theologians to harmonize them and show their general spirit and meaning, rather than to draw conclusions from any particular class of subjects. Any system of deductions from texts of Scripture which are offset by texts of equal authority but apparently different meaning, is necessarily one-sided and imperfect, and therefore narrow. That is exactly the difficulty under which Calvin labored." Again Dr. Lord says: "And it was the great error of attaching too much importance to metaphysical divinity that has led to such a revulsion from his peculiar system in after times."

CHAPTER XIII

THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY UPON JOHN WESLEY'S THEOLOGY

John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, was the son of Samuel Wesley, a learned rector of the Episcopal Church, and his saintly wife, Susannah. He was born at Epworth, England, in 1703, and died in London, in 1791. Like Voltaire he lived almost through the century, but his influence was very different from that of the great literary Frenchman. This noted reformer was of strong stock; his father, grandfather, greatgrandfather, and his mother's father, were ministers who had been persecuted for fidelity to conviction. His father and mother had dissented from dissenters and from conviction had gone back to the Established Church. He was deprived of support by his friends, and went to Oxford with only two pounds and sixteen shillings. John Wesley's older brother, Samuel, was much opposed to the movement of his brother, and remonstrated with his mother for uniting with John's congregation.

When John Wesley was six years old, his father's house was set on fire by some profligate persons who had been rebuked for their conduct. All the children had been brought out except little John, who had been left in the burning building. He could not be reached through the door, but climbed to a window, and was lifted out. This event ever made a serious impression upon both him and his mother, and they felt that he was reserved for a great work.

In 1720, at the age of seventeen, John Wesley went to Oxford University, where he remained until 1727, and received the degree of Master of Arts. He was distinguished at the university specially for his logical attainments and skill. He had determined to be a minister,

and his pious mother had written him some beautiful letters in reference to worldly pleasures. One of her rules is especially important: "Whatever weakens your reason, impairs the tenderness of your conscience, obscures your sense of God, or takes off your relish for spiritual things—in short, which increases the strength and authority of your body over your mind—that is a sin to you, however innocent in itself." The books which greatly interested young Wesley while at college, were "The Imitation of Christ," by Thomas A. Kempis, and "Holy Living and Dying," by Jeremy Taylor.

While John Wesley was two years away from Oxford, assisting his father, his brother Charles and others formed a religious society at the university. On his return, John became a member of the society, and soon its leader. They were ridiculed by the young men of Oxford, and called Bible Bigots, the Holy Club, and Methodists. The last name continued to adhere to the followers of Wesley after Methodism had become a very different thing from what it was at Oxford. The movement of Wesley and his associates at Oxford was necessary, for religion, at that time, was at a very low ebb in England. (See the author's *Struggles and Triumphs of the Truth*.)

Influence of Scholasticism upon Wesley's Theology

Scholasticism had not lost its influence at Oxford when Wesley was a student at the university. He became noted for his attainments in philosophy especially in logic. Scholasticism wielded an influence upon John Wesley long after he had come under the influence of German Mysticism. He held firmly to the ordinances of the church, and in organization he reminds us of some of the orders of the Middle Ages.

John Wesley was probably the greatest opponent that Calvinism has ever had. Some of his greatest works were written against this system of theology. He and Whitfield finally parted company, because Whitfield was a Calvinist. There are yet a few scattered Methodist congregations which follow Whitfield. I found a Calvinistic Methodist church in Scranton, Pennsylvania.

John Wesley was a follower of Arminius. Arminius was a distinguished Dutch theologian of the sixteenth century. He was much opposed to the Calvinism of his day, and advocated a reformed theology, which has from that time borne his name. The Encyclopaedia Britannica gives the following summary of Arminianism: (1) The decree of God is, when it concerns His own actions, absolute, but when it concerns man's, conditional, *i. e.*, the decree relative to the Saviour to be appointed and the salvation to be provided is absolute, but the decree relative to the persons saved or condemned is made to depend on the acts—belief and repentance in the one case, unbelief and impenitence in the other—of the persons themselves. (2) The providence or government of God while sovereign, is exercised in harmony with the nature of the creatures governed, *i. e.*, the sovereignty of God is so exercised as to be compatible with the freedom of man. (3) Man is by original nature, through the assistance of divine grace, free, able to will and perform the right; but is in his fallen state, of and by himself, unable to do so; needs to be regenerated in his own powers before he can do what is good and pleasing to God. (4) Divine grace originates, maintains, and perfects all the good in man, so much so that he cannot, though regenerate, conceive, will, or do any good thing without it. (5) The saints possess, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, sufficient strength to persevere to the end in spite of sin and the flesh, but may so decline from sound doctrine as to make divine grace to be ineffectual. (6) Every believer may be certain or assured of his own salvation. (7) It is possible for a regenerate man to live without sin.

Influence of Mysticism upon Wesley's Theology

In his voyage to America, John Wesley had come in contact with the Moravians, in whom he had become greatly interested. Soon after he returned to England he hunted them up, and even visited Herrnhut, Germany, the center of their operations. There he conversed with Count Zinzendorf and Christian David, the great Moravian leaders. These Moravians were Mystics, and German

philosophical Mysticism has had a powerful influence upon religion. It was from the Moravians that John Wesley obtained the Mystical element in his theology. This has had much to do with the marvelous enthusiasm of Methodism. The object of Count Zinzendorf was to produce a reformation in the Lutheran Church, and not to establish another sect. He was a great advocate of Christian union. John Wesley followed much the same course. He wanted to bring about a reformation in the Episcopal Church, and actually remained a member of it until his death. He did not want to establish another sect. While Wesley agreed with the Moravians on the subject of conversion, he did not agree with them on some other points; and in 1740 there was a formal and final separation between him and them.

Zinzendorf was noted for the great emphasis he placed upon feelings in religion; and Bengel criticises him on the ground that all the great questions of duty are made to depend upon feelings alone. It is very evident that Wesley was much indebted to the Moravians for his own peculiar position of the importance of feelings as an evidence of conversion, and, also, for "the love feast" which has been so characteristic in the history of Methodism.

In 1902, President Eliot, of Harvard University, delivered an address before an audience of Methodist ministers in Boston, in which he said: "As I weigh the forces that affect mankind and look back upon the course of human history and the progress of Christianity it seems to me the first and greatest civilizer is steady work. That is the way by which the race is lifted up out of barbarism into semi-civilization and into civilization. Labor, steady labor is a great civilizer. The Protestant churches are too intellectual and too emotional on the part of the preacher or teacher, and call for too little personal exertion on the part of the recipient of inspiration. At the Sunday-school I don't learn that the children are working actively. They only have half an hour a week, and no other subject could be dealt with in that way by any pupil. So I distrust the method of the Sunday-school and the attitude of the pupil. He is not

called on to produce anything. The emotional side is developed, perhaps more largely in the Methodist church. Is that wholesome for getting labor out of the individuals? I find it does me no good to get my emotions stirred up unless I can do something about it all. This church has made great effort to get means to apply in young people the force of this emotion, but has it been successful?"

The Boston Advertiser highly complimented President Eliot's address, and stated that the Methodism of today had outgrown the emotionalism which was its peculiarity and main source in the past.

The Northwestern Christian Advocate, a leading Methodist organ in this country thus comments on President Eliot's address: "President Eliot is a Unitarian which religious belief particularly appeals to the ethical and intellectual life of man. Mr. Eliot himself is a great educator, but his lack of appreciation of the emotional element in men would prevent his being a great leader of the people. Such leaders are not necessarily of the emotional type, but everyone who would be a leader of the people must possess the power which awakens emotional response in the hearts of the masses. It is true that Methodism has appealed to the emotional nature in men. The awakening of the emotions, however, is not so much in the preacher—though it may sometimes be so—as in the hearer. It is a singular fact that John Wesley, who was the calmest, most dispassionate, unemotional of the Methodist preachers of his time, more strongly stirred the emotions of his hearers by his plain, but powerful, denunciation of sin and individual wickedness than perhaps any other Methodist preacher, and his preaching was attended by more marked manifestations of feeling than that of others more emotional in their manner."

This emotional element John Wesley obtained from the Moravians, and they largely obtained it from the Mystical philosophy of the Germans. Mysticism in all ages has had a powerful influence upon the human mind, and it has been one of the important factors in the progress of Civilization. While Methodism has doubtless carried emotionalism too far, some other religious bodies have not carried it far enough. While other religious bodies

can doubtless teach the Methodists many important things, the Methodists can teach them the importance of developing the emotional element in man's nature. The Unitarians and Methodists began their work about the same time; now the Unitarians number less than one hundred thousand members, while the Methodists number more than five millions.

CHAPTER XIV

THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY UPON ALEXANDER CAMPBELL'S THEOLOGY

The name of Alexander Campbell is inseparably connected with the Reformation of the Nineteenth century. Luther and Calvin were the central figures of the Sixteenth century; John Wesley of the Eighteenth; and Thomas and Alexander Campbell of the Nineteenth. While Alexander Campbell was greatly indebted to his father, Thomas Campbell, and Thomas was doubtless the beginner of this great reformation, still Alexander Campbell was the central figure in the Reformation of the Nineteenth century.

This great reformer was born in Antrim county, Ireland in 1788, and died at Bethany, West Virginia, in 1866. His ancestors on his father's side were Scotch, and his grandfather Archibald was a soldier in the British army under General Wolfe. He was in early life a Romanist; but after the taking of Quebec he joined the church of England. His father Thomas Campbell was of medium size, compactly built, and was considered very handsome. In early life he acquired a great love of the Bible, and became a diligent student of it. He became a member of the Secession branch of the Presbyterian Church, and was anxious to prepare for the ministry. His father for a time opposed it, but finally consented. While at college he became a classmate of Thomas Campbell, the poet, who was also his cousin. Thomas Campbell, who had a lovely disposition, had great influence over his father, but did not always escape his father's hasty temper. While he was preparing for the ministry, he was permitted to conduct worship in his father's family; and on one occasion he kept them kneeling so long that his father was in great pain on account of his rheumatism. When

they arose, young Thomas got a caning which taught him an important lesson on long prayers.

While teaching school and preparing for the ministry, Thomas Campbell became acquainted with Miss Jane Corneigle, to whom he was afterwards married. Her ancestors were French Huguenots, who had fled from France on account of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV. She had been brought up by a pious mother, and was a woman of great force of character. Her son Alexander is said to have been very much like her.

Thomas Campbell took great interest in the education of Alexander, who was his oldest child. The boy was not at all precocious. Bacon was a philosopher in his boyhood, and Calvin a preacher at eighteen; but Alexander Campbell in his boyhood loved out-door sports much better than he loved his books. One interesting anecdote is told of his boyhood. At the age of nine his father added to his other studies the French language. One day he went out under a shade-tree to get a lesson in the "Adventures of Telemachus." He became tired, and dropped asleep. A cow that was near by devoured it, and Thomas declared that the cow had more French in her stomach than Alexander had in his head. Thomas wisely put his son at manual labor, and it was not long until the intellect asserted itself. Alexander Campbell was prepared by his father for the university. The father was a thorough believer in the Lockian philosophy, and Alexander even before he entered the university had given much attention to the study of the philosophy of the great Englishman. When Alexander entered the University of Glasgow he made great progress. He was especially noted for his progress in history and philosophy. It is perfectly proper to state that in philosophy he was a disciple of John Locke. In many ways did the Lockian Philosophy influence the Theology of Alexander Campbell. See the author's *Struggles and Triumphs of the Truth*.

1. The Lockian Philosophy had a powerful influence upon Alexander Campbell's views of the nature of God. Locke and his disciples looked upon the Divine Being as strictly transcendent; they thought that he had created the heavens and the earth; and that from his throne in

the heavens they were contemplated by him. They emphasized the transcendence of God to the neglect of his immanence. They took very largely the opposite view to that of the Mystics. Both parties took extreme positions. While Alexander Campbell did not deny the immanence of God, he was a disciple of John Locke. The difference between deists and Christians at that time was the fact that Christians believed that the transcendent God had from time to time revealed his will to man. The deists denied this.

Mr. Campbell believed that we are indebted to divine revelation for all our knowledge of God and spiritual things. In his debate with Robert Owen he used the following language: "Locke, Hume, and all mental philosophers, have agreed upon certain premises. Mirabeau agrees with Locke and Hume. They all agree that all our original ideas are the result of sensation and reflection." Mr. Campbell claimed that neither sensation nor reflection could give man an idea of God, and as the God idea had been in the world from time immemorial, God must have revealed his will to man. Again we quote from this debate: "But we have an idea of God, of a Creator, a being who has produced the whole material universe by the bare exhibition of his physical creative power. This idea, we contend, can have no archetype in nature, because we have never seen anything produced out of nothing." It is certain that the revelation through Christ was essential to a knowledge of the very essence of God, but it is going too far to say that nature affords us no knowledge of the attributes of God. Read Romans first chapter and twentieth verse: "For the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity; so that they may be without excuse."

2 The Lockian Philosophy influenced Alexander Campbell on the question of Divine Revelation. John Locke in his religious writings endeavored to bring about a return to Biblical Christianity. He wrote an interesting work on "The Reasonableness of Christianity as Delivered in the Scriptures;" the purpose of which was to

lay aside the traditions of the past, and return to the Bible as the only religious rule for both faith and practice. This position was earnestly advocated by both Thomas and Alexander Campbell. Alexander Campbell says in his *Christian System*: "There is not a spiritual idea in the whole human race which is not drawn from the Bible." Mr. Campbell maintained stoutly in the Christian Baptist that all knowledge of God and of the invisible world is derived either directly or indirectly from the Bible. He still farther maintained that all spiritual knowledge contained in the philosophic and theological systems of heathen writers had as its original source the Bible. In his debate with Mr. Owen he maintained the proposition that skeptics unaided by Divine Revelation could not even know that there is a God, and that they have in them a spiritual nature superior to the brute. Mr. Campbell insisted that upon the acknowledged principles of Locke, the Christian philosopher, and of Hume, the skeptic, all the boasted religious knowledge claimed by Deistical school was really plagiarism from the Bible. We thus see that he fully endorsed the philosophical position of John Locke.

On one point, Mr. Campbell seems to have gone beyond Locke. Locke maintained that the existence of God could be demonstrated. Although many of his disciples thought him inconsistent, the philosopher, nevertheless, believed in certain intuitions, which enabled him to fully prove the existence of God. Mr. Campbell would not allow this, but claimed that all spiritual knowledge must come from the Bible. He was consequently a believer in verbal revelation. All revelation, he claimed, must be given to the intellect through the senses. He does not always adhere strictly to this position, and sometimes transcends his own theology; but mainly he was true to this Lockian position on the limitation of knowledge. The following from the *Christian Baptist* shows that Mr. Campbell placed limitations upon his theory of verbal inspiration: "I do not believe that the book commonly called the Bible is properly denominated a divine revelation, or communication from the Deity to the human race. At the same time I am convinced that in this volume

there are revelations or communications from the Deity to man" (p. 344).

3. Alexander Campbell was influenced by the Philosophy of John Locke in his Doctrine of the Operation of the Holy Spirit. Mr. Campbell was much opposed to the Mysticism of his day. Theology in the early part of the nineteenth century taught that religion was a kind of foreign substance, coming directly down from heaven, infusing itself into man's nature, even before he believed. Some claimed that they had been regenerated by the direct impact of the Holy Spirit years before they were believers at all. The Mystical theory had lead many into skepticism. When a young man at the University of Glasgow, Mr. Campbell had heard the Haldanes and others preach against this ruinous theory. In his debate with N. L. Rice, as he had before done in the Christian Baptist, Mr. Campbell thoroughly demolished this theory. He was thoroughly Lockian in advocating the position that in conversion and sanctification the Holy Spirit operates through the word of truth.

In some things, Mr. Campbell became too great for the philosophy of the Enlightenment. He transcended it in his teachings in reference to the Holy Spirit. He condemned both the Spirit-alone theory and the Word-alone theory. The following will show how severe he was on the word-alone theory: "Some of those who were professed advocates of the Reformation were led to construct a word-alone theory which virtually dispensed with the great promise of the gospel—the gift of the Holy Spirit to believers. These persons were found chiefly among those who had been previously skeptical, and who were habitually disposed to rely upon reason rather than to walk by faith; and their crude and erroneous doctrines were well calculated to bring reproach upon the Reformation. They were disposed to resolve religion entirely into a system of moral motivity; to disbelieve the actual indwelling of the Holy Spirit in believers; to deny special providences and guidings, and, by consequence, the efficacy of prayer. Taking Locke's philosophy as the basis of their system, and carrying his 'Essay on the Human Understanding' along with their Bible in their

saddle-bags, they denied even to its Creator any access to the human soul except by 'words and arguments,' while they conceded to the *author* of evil a direct approach, and had more to say in their discourses about 'the laws of human nature' than about the gospel of Christ.'" *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell* by Robert Richardson, Vol. II, pp. 349, 350.

Mr. Campbell was much opposed to this theory and did all he could to counteract it. He declared that the Holy Spirit was as necessary to new life in the kingdom of God as the atmosphere was to animal life in the kingdom of nature. It is proper to state that there are but few among the Disciples of Christ at the present time who hold to the word-alone theory.

4. The Philosophy of Locke had an important influence upon the Theology of Alexander Campbell in Reference to the Nature of Faith. In the last half of the Eighteenth and the first half of the Nineteenth century the Protestant world was largely under the influence of mysticism. Faith was regarded only as a feeling coming after a supernatural regeneration; and feeling was really the only test of conversion. If a man could say that he felt he was saved that was usually considered a sufficient experience. In Europe at the close of the Eighteenth century a number of theologians, who had been influenced by the philosophy of Enlightenment, revolted against the extreme mystical theory of conversion. Some of these went to the opposite extreme, and made faith only an assent to testimony.

Alexander Campbell largely avoided both extremes. While he was a thorough Lockian, and taught that faith was dependent upon testimony, at the same time he included in faith that element of trust so plainly taught by Christ and his apostles.

5. The Lockian Philosophy is clearly Visible in Alexander Campbell's views of the Kingdom of God. Dr. W. E. Garrison, in his work on Alexander Campbell's Theology says: "In the systematizing of Mr. Campbell's doctrinal ideas, the central place must be given to his idea of the Kingdom of God. Around this the other doctrines group themselves, and their relations to it determine the form which they are to take. This is

necessarily so from the character of his problem and the means which he has adopted for its solution. The unity of the church is to be found by making the terms of ecclesiastical fellowship as nearly as possible co-incident with the conditions of citizenship in the Kingdom of God. The latter are to be determined by an appeal to Scripture. The idea of the Kingdom of God thus became the center for the reconstruction, and the practical problem of unity compelled him to emphasize especially one phase of the Kingdom of God, viz., the terms of admission, or the conditions of citizenship."

Again Mr. Garrison says: "In the formulation of this doctrine, the influence of the Dutch theologians is most strikingly apparent. There are two implications which go with a doctrine of the covenants: *first*, the idea of successive dispensations, as being the stages in the history of the process of salvation, and therewith the sharp distinction between the present Christian dispensation and the Covenant of the Law which has been transcended; *second*, the conception of the relation between man and God as one of covenant or agreement, into which man enters voluntarily, by the acceptance of certain specified conditions on the basis of definite promises."

Alexander Campbell was Lockian in his opposition to everything of a visionary character. Much had been said and written about the invisible kingdom, and the prayer of Christ for the union of his disciples was supposed to be fulfilled in the invisible kingdom. Mr. Campbell insisted that the Bible knows nothing about an invisible kingdom, and that the Saviour's prayer must be accomplished in the Kingdom of God upon this earth. He fully believed in the final triumphs of God's Kingdom in all parts of this world. He drew a clear distinction between the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Dispensations; the Patriarchal was family, the Jewish national, and the Christian universal. He fully believed in the law of progressive development, and thought that many Christians made a mistake in confounding the Christian Dispensation with the Jewish. Christians are not under the Law of Moses, but the Law of Christ. The Christian Law frees us from the law of sin and death.

CHAPTER XV

THE CONTRIBUTION OF PHILOSOPHY TO THE NEW THEOLOGY

Some oppose reason in religion, but in the very nature of things reason will enter the domain of religion. The New Theology is sufficient evidence of this. It is largely a philosophical movement, and wishes to explain religion in harmony with what is supposed to be the highest reason. It contains both truth and error and is doubtless necessary to counteract its opposite extreme. The following language by Dr. A. M. Fairbairn, in his excellent work entitled, "The Philosophy of the Christian Religion," will be read with interest: "The only condition on which reason could have nothing to do with religion, is that religion should have nothing to do with truth. For in every controversy concerning what is and what is not truth, reason and not authority is the supreme arbiter; the authority that decides against reason commits itself to a conflict which is certain to issue in defeat. The men who defend faith must think as well as the men who oppose it; their argumentative processes must be rational and their conclusions supported by rational proofs. If it were illicit for reason to touch the mysteries of religion, the Church would never have had a creed or believed a doctrine, nor would man have possessed a faith higher than the mythical fancies which pleased his childhood. Without the exercise of reason we should never have had the Fourth Gospel or the Pauline Epistles, or any one of those treatises on the Godhead, the Incarnation, or the Atonement, from Athanasius to Hegel, or from Augustine to our own day, which have done more than all the decrees of all the Councils, or all the Creeds of all the Churches, to keep faith living and religion a reality. The man who despises or distrusts the reason despises the God who

gave it, and the most efficient of all the servants, He has bidden work within and upon man in behalf of truth. Here, at least, it may be honestly said there is no desire to build Faith upon the negation of Reason; where both are sons of God it were sin to seek to make the one legitimate at the expense of the other's legitimacy."

Kant and his successors have greatly contributed to the New Theology. This distinguished German employed a critical method in philosophy, which was afterwards adopted by a number of theologians. It became so transcendental that in some cases it was thought to supercede altogether the necessity of a divine revelation. We have had a good illustration in what has been known as Transcendentalism in New England. The successors of the New England theologians now largely belong to the New Theology.

Hegel has wielded more influence on Theology than probably any other modern philosopher. It is quite certain that without him we never would have had the "Leben Jesu" of Strauss, and without it the modern tendencies in philosophy might have been different. I well know that he belonged to the Left Wing of the Hegelian philosophy; still he was educated in the school of Hegel. With Hegel himself the Godhead was so construed as to involve incarnation, but the Incarnation involved was universal. Many had great difficulty in harmonizing this position with the incarnation of Christ, which was specific.

The Philosophy of Evolution has been an important contributor to the New Theology. All religion is considered an evolution, and Christianity is not regarded so much as a supernatural religion as the product of evolutionary forces. It would not be proper to regard all advocates of the New Theology as discarding the supernatural, but there is certainly a tendency in that direction.

The Supernatural

On its constructive side the New Theology is probably the most conspicuous religious fact of the present age. It is not so much a theology as a tendency. This move-

ment has largely grown out of the marvelous progress of modern science. The constant study of nature has given a great impetus to naturalism which has greatly gained on the supernatural. It has reached a great extreme, and is even more dangerous than an extreme supernaturalism.

There is really no conflict between the natural and supernatural when properly understood. The common idea of miracle, that it is a violation of the laws of nature, has caused some able writers to reject the supernatural altogether. This position places a method of operation in the place of the thing itself, and could not otherwise than lead to false conclusions. A careful study of the miracles of the Bible will lead the candid student to the following conclusion: That a miracle is a manifestation of God's power in behalf of his servants, or in attestation of a revelation to man. We have no reason to believe that a miracle is wrought without means; but such means are out of the reach of man. Miracles are not against nature any more than one natural event is against another; and if we were able to discover the laws by which they were wrought, it would not destroy their true character of attestation to divine truth, unless the means by which they were wrought were within the reach of man.

No one can consistently deny the miraculous who believes in the existence of God. Even Mr. J. S. Mill admits that if there be a God, it is at least probable that he has revealed himself to man. If God has ever in any way revealed himself to his creatures, it forever settles the question of the miraculous. A miracle can not, then, be looked upon as violating that axiom of science, that like causes, under like circumstances, are followed by the same effects. God introduces new causes, and new effects must be the result.

I do not, therefore, understand by the supernatural something contrary to all reason, but that which is super-human and above the common laws of nature. We believe that the supernatural comes within the domain of law, but it is a higher law than any with which we are now acquainted. All nature originated in the miraculous, and it is impossible for even philosophers to banish the supernatural.

The Supernatural in Creation

We will briefly consider this subject, first, from the Inductive standpoint. We take man as we find him; consider what he is and what he has accomplished in this world. The Philosophers of Evolution have found a great likeness between the physical organization of man and that of what is called the ape-like man. Some seem to think that the ape-like man, as he is the older, is the more venerable of the two. It makes no difference what likeness they have found; when we consider what man has accomplished in commerce, literature and art, he certainly represents the supernatural in comparison to the ape-like man. In many things man transcends nature, and makes the natural forces his servants.

We may also state that the higher animals represent the supernatural in comparison with the vegetable. In the animal we find sensation and feeling, and we cannot account for their origin without a Creator who has sensation and feeling. The vegetable, which has life, represents the supernatural in comparison with the mineral. There can be no life in creation without life in the Creator. We must therefore conclude that the supernatural was necessarily involved in the origin of life.

From the Deductive standpoint, we also find the supernatural in creation. We begin with the study of life, and find that the material universe could not of itself produce life. Life could not come of the lifeless; and as matter is lifeless, it required mind to produce life. Even Mr. Darwin had to start his system of Evolution from antecedent life.

Mr. Bain makes matter a double-faced unity, having matter on one side and mind on the other. This is only begging the question; for when mind is put into matter, it must be placed there by the supernatural. It is as useless for philosophers to try to banish the supernatural from this universe, as for them to try to banish the natural. What God has joined together, let not man put asunder.

The Supernatural Character of Christ

The life of Christ exactly corresponded with that of a supernatural teacher and a supernatural worker. Not a man among the keen-eyed critics, or the worst opposers of Christianity has ever been able to find a single example where Jesus has violated in practice anything that he had taught. In his life, we certainly find the supernatural. A careful student will find in it a perfect character. It is strange that the people in general are not more impressed with the perfect character of Christ. There is so much novelty in man's nature that good people will take more interest in some eccentric fanatic than in the perfect character presented in the New Testament. We account for it on the principle that men are frequently more interested in a torch light than in the great orb of day. As the study of the sun is neglected by the masses, so it is only the few who faithfully study the character of the Sun of Righteousness. Artists in their portraits of Christ represent all his faculties as perfectly developed; so he lacked nothing in the intellect, in the sensibilities, or in the will. He had a heart of universal sympathy. His love could not be confined to any one nation; but it embraced the world within the bounds of its comprehensiveness. He had a perfect will, and was, therefore, able to resist all temptation and live a perfect life. He was the way, the truth, and the life.

I have been as much interested in the writings of Dr. A. M. Fairbairn as in those of any man belonging to the school of the New Theology. In his *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, we find the following in reference to the Supernatural in the Life of Christ: "There never was a loftier idea, or one better calculated to challenge prompt and complete contradiction, than the one expressed in our Gospels, models though they be of simplicity in narrative and language. Their common purpose is to describe the life and record the work of a person they conceived to be miraculous. Critics differ, and with good reason, as to the degree of the miraculous which the evangelists severally attribute to His person. Mark does not, like

John, speak of him in the terms of Eternity and Deity. John and Mark do not like Matthew and Luke, write of a supernatural conception and birth. And it may be argued, from the small place accorded to it and its presence in only two of our extant documents, that the idea of a supernatural birth was not held to be essential to the idea of a supernatural person. But what is common to all four Evangelists, and what is in their mind essential, is the idea not that the miraculous history proves the person to be supernatural, but that the history was miraculous because it articulated and manifested the supernatural person. The Gospels may indeed be described as the interpretation of this person in the terms of history; and so regarded, the Jesus of Mark is as miraculous as the Jesus of John. There is more than art, there is real philosophy, in the evangelical standpoint and method; for the supernatural personality is more able to make the supernatural in nature and history real and credible than the miraculous in nature and history is able to make the supernatural personality living and intelligible."

The Nature of Divine Revelation

Dr. Fairbairn says: "Revelation is necessary to the being of religion, and religion is but the symbol of the kindred natures and correlated energies of God and man. It means that each nature seeks the other, is capable of finding it, and is susceptible to its touch. Religion may be described as man's consciousness of supernatural relations, or his belief in the reciprocal activities of his own spirit and the *divine*. The activity of the Divine is creative and communicative, of the human is receptive and responsive. The phenomena correspondent to the former are those of revelation; to the latter, those of faith, worship, and obedience. So inseparable are these ideas both in thought and reality that a religion can as little exist without something representative of revelation as without faith and worship. The great religions have written revelations, but writing is not necessary to the idea. The faith of China is embodied in its classical books, of India in its Vedas, of Buddhism in its Tripit-

akas, of Persia in the Zend Avesta, of Islam in the Koran. But the Delphic Oracle or the Oak of Dodona was to Greece the voice of its god; the augur interpreted the divine will to Rome; the Book of the Dead revealed it to the Egyptians; the priest and the astrologer to the Babylonian.

“The veriest savage would neither flatter nor beat his fetish unless he thought it could communicate with him. Without, therefore, the belief in revelation, religion could not exist; indeed, so necessary is the one to the other that even a faith like Positivism, consciously constructed upon the denial of the supernatural, has to make *Le Grand Etre* communicate of his wealth to the unit before the unit can either praise or worship. Of every religion, therefore, the idea of revelation is an integral part; the man who does not believe that God can speak to him will not speak to God.”

There seems to be but one step from Deism to Atheism; for if there is a God he must, in some way, have revealed himself to man. It is difficult to account for the languages of the world, and we certainly cannot account for the great religions of the world on any other hypothesis than the fact that God has from time to time communicated his will to man. The religious nature of man is such that it demands a divine revelation for its own culture and development. The soul can no more do without religion than the body can do without food. In the very nature of things revelation must come from within. Natural religion is man seeking after God; revealed religion is God seeking after man. God's revelation has always been adapted to the mental powers of man. We clearly see this in the Patriarchal, in the Jewish, and in the Chrisitan Dispensation.

God revealed his will to the Patriarchs. Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. Biblical History is distinguished from all other history by the Theophanic presence of God. As God's immanence in nature is taught in Genesis, so we find also taught in the same book the presence of God with his people. As even Geikie teaches that satan was not necessarily visible in the temptation of Christ, so in God's appearing to the

patriarchs visibility to the natural eyes is not necessarily always implied. God's revelation to them was evidently to a great extent suggestions from within. The miracles of the Bible show that God was present in Redemption as well as in Nature; and the prophecies disclose the presence of God in his servants assisting them in the proper instruction of his people. It is interesting to note that the miracles of the Bible are associated with the Theophanic presence of God. This was true at the Exodus from Egypt, and the entrance into Canaan. We find the same thing true in the times of Elijah and Elisha. This period in Hebrew history was especially noted for its Theophanies. The miracles of the New Testament were wrought by Christ and his apostles in connection with the Theophanies of the Holy Spirit. When we admit God's immanence in nature, then Theophanies and miracles in the Scheme of Redemption are most natural. The prophecies of the Bible are very largely connected with Theophanies. In this way the prophets of the Old Testament were called; and also the apostles of the New Testament were commissioned by Christophanies and Pneumatophanies.

In harmony with this view of Biblical History, we find Theophany connected with the Garden of Eden. The happy pair were instructed in the way of life by their Creator; and if they had lived up to his requirements they always would have been happy. Like children who think they know more than their parents, Adam and Eve were in search of knowledge and experience which character of knowledge has in all ages led to sin. The young people of the present age are as anxious for a knowledge of evil as were the first pair. God revealed to Adam in Eden, the future triumphs of the seed of the woman over the serpent. Adam was a type of Christ and Eve was a type of the Church. It was in the Second Adam, the Lord from heaven, that the seed of the woman triumphed over satan.

The early chapters of Genesis are poems containing brief but charming stories of the origin and early history of mankind. They bear evidence of great antiquity. When their poetic nature is understood, scientific writers

certainly have no reason to find fault with them. It is only those who push Genesis to the extreme of literalism, that are able to find any conflict between science and Genesis. When twentieth century scientific writers are able to produce poems on creation superior to the early chapters of Genesis, it will then be time enough for them to find fault with the earliest literature in the world.

God revealed his will to the prophets. Moses predicted that the Lord God would raise up to Israel a prophet like unto himself. In no person has this language been fulfilled except in the Messiah. Simon Peter was certainly correct in applying it to Jesus the Christ. Not to mention many others the second and the one hundred and tenth Psalms certainly teach God's revelation in these matchless poems. Isaiah gives graphic pictures of the birth, life, death and resurrection of the Messiah. He also presents in vision the future triumphs of the kingdom of the Messiah. The seventh, eighth and ninth chapters which are truly Messianic in their character all the Higher Critics admit were written by Isaiah himself. While they claim that the fifty-third chapter was written by another Isaiah, still they all agree that it was written long before the coming of Christ, and its evidential value therefore is not seriously affected. God's will is certainly revealed in the Book of Isaiah. The prophet Jeremiah was associated with the pious Josiah in his great reform work. This prophet clearly predicts the birth of the Messiah and graphically describes the Messianic reign. The thirty and thirty-first chapters possess great power and beauty. They are hexameter in movement, and in some respects surpass all other predictions of the spirituality, universality and transcendent worth of the New Covenant in comparison with the Old. Any careful student of the Book of Jeremiah will certainly reach the conclusion that Jehovah certainly spake to this great prophet. The prophet Ezekiel was the first of the Exile and was of priestly descent; consequently the temple is always before his eyes. He clearly predicted its restoration and a glory far exceeding anything that had been in its previous history. Jehovah would ever be the Shepherd of his people, and the time would come when their heart of stone

would be taken away and a heart of flesh given them. His predictions are clearly Messianic. The dry bones described in the thirty-seventh chapter refer to Israel as a nation and not to the general resurrection of the dead. The restoration of Israel means the triumphs of the Kingdom of the Messiah. Ezekiel is another example of the fact that holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.

God revealed his will to man through Christ. This was his highest revelation. All other revelations were only preparatory to this. Revelation becomes complete in the Christ; for he revealed the very nature of God to man. He brought God to man. He fully understood God's nature and man's nature and brought the two together. The deaf are also dumb; and the man who will not hear God through his Son, will never talk to God. It is useless to compare deism with Christianity, for deism has no communication from God; the God of deism is deaf and dumb. God's revelation through his Son teaches the immanence of God in its most perfect form; for Jesus was God manifested in the flesh. This revelation also places humanity at its best, for the Christ was the *son of man*, as well as the Son of God. God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself.

The True Doctrine of Inspiration

Inspiration is not Consecration. When the Holy Spirit inspires a person, it does not necessarily sanctify him; its purpose is to convey truth. Balaam and Caiaphas were inspired, but they were far from being consecrated men. This shows that inspiration is designed for the impartation of truth, and it is distinct from sanctification.

Inspiration is not Omniscience. The Holy Spirit does not impart all truth to the inspired person, but only a portion of it. It is principally religious truth, and only secular truth so far as it is necessary to the impartation of religious truth. The knowledge of the person inspired may be more limited on many subjects than is the knowledge of those not inspired. On many subjects the Greeks and Romans were far more intellectual than were the

inspired writers of the Bible. Even on questions of inspiration some inspired men had more knowledge than others. The doctrine of the incarnation is at first disclosed only so far as the promise of the seed of the woman. This is a very different thing from its enlargement, as presented by the prophet Isaiah.

Inspiration is Personal. It is only in a secondary sense that we can speak of the Bible as inspired. It is composed of many books, and certainly contains the writings of many inspired men. There is not a book in the Bible that I would be willing to have rejected from the canon; but we cannot speak of the canon as inspired. I fully believe that every book in the Bible contains revealed truth; but still we must remember that inspiration specially pertains to persons and not to books. While this is true, it is still a fact that the truth which the Bible contains would not have been revealed as it has been if no Bible had come into existence. Even the greatest prophets in Israel were influenced by the preceding history and prophecy of the nation. Even Christ and his apostles were greatly influenced by the sacred writings of the Jewish nation.

Inspiration especially pertains to religious truth. The revelation which accounts for the books of the Bible was a historical process of the self-disclosure of God as the Redeemer of man, and this culminated in the Christ. The inspiration which accounts for these books was an inward spiritual movement corresponding to the revelation, and which purified and elevated the thoughts and feelings of the people possessing this revelation. While I am not willing to admit errors in the original autographs of the sacred Scriptures, still I well know that the inspired writers were greatly limited in their knowledge of secular affairs. The Bible was given to teach us how to go to heaven, and not how the heavens go; still I believe that if we had the original autographs of the sacred books where they incidentally speak of scientific subjects they speak the truth. A true philosopher has no great difficulty in harmonizing the Bible, as we have it, with modern science, and if we had the original autographs, I feel fully satisfied that we would find them errorless. The

farther we go back, the fewer errors we find, and if we could go back to the fountain-head, we would doubtless find it perfectly pure.

Revelation and inspiration are in harmony with the law of evolution. New truth comes into the world that is old, and all truth must conform to certain historical conditions. In the early history of the race, religious as well as all other truth must be adapted to the period of childhood. For this reason we have the patriarchal dispensation preceding the national dispensation of the Israelites. The national religion of Israel was necessary in order to prepare the world for a universal religion. Our Saviour was a true evolutionist when he said, "First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." Revelation and inspiration were exactly adapted to each dispensation. Christ and his apostles did not claim perfection for the old covenant, or there would have been no place for the new; while they found fault with it for their own age, it was perfectly adapted to the age for which it was given. God in sundry times and in divers manners spake unto the fathers by the prophets; but in the fullness of time, when the world was prepared for the great event, he spake by his Son. This was God's highest revelation to man. It took a long time for the world to be fully prepared for God's complete revelation in his own Son.

The Philosophy of the Atonement

The New Theology, which accepts the Philosophy of Evolution, has greatly modified the old theories of the Atonement. While this is true, all thoughtful students must admit that the old theories contain important elements of truth. When the world was largely at war, it is not surprising that the idea of ransom should largely enter into the doctrine of the Atonement. It is evident that it was carried to an extreme; still it is true that Christ gave himself a ransom for many (Matt. 20:28; Tim. 2:6). Those who denounce the idea of ransom in the Atonement are wrong, for it is Scriptural. There is also an element of truth in what is called the commercial

theory, for we were bought with a price (I Cor. 6:20; 7:23). The theory of substitution carries with it very important truth, for Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures (I Cor. 15:3).

Dr. A. M. Fairbairn says: "Is the sacrifice here conceived as vicarious? This has been met with a very decided negative; and it has been argued that substitution was unknown to the Levitical sacrifices, which were gifts to God rather than expiatory sufferings; and that the 'scapegoat' which bore the sins of Israel was a symbolical act, but no proper sacrifice, for it was not offered to God, but driven away into the desert. This may or may not be true, but it does not determine the question. For Christ's sacrifice, like His priesthood, stands in an order by itself. Christ offered Himself to God. Why? For our sins. Wherein was He distinguished from the Levitical high priests? He was sinless, they were sinful, and so while they needed to offer for themselves, He did not. How, then, shall we conceive a sacrificial act which was purely for others, and in no respect for the offerer Himself? We may be too fastidious to use the terms 'vicarious' and 'substitutionary,' but it is easier to object to the terms than to escape the idea they express.

"This exposition, then, leaves us with the principle already formulated: a person is substituted for an institution, one uncreated and immortal Priest supercedes all mortal and visible priesthoods. The full significance of this has yet to be seen, but one point may here be emphasized—the change in the priesthood signified a radical change in the relation of God to sacrifice. In the Levitical, as in other religious systems, the sacrifice was offered to please God, to win His favour, to propitiate Him by the surrender of some object precious to man. But in the Christian system this standpoint is transcended: the initiative lies with God, for in the fine phrase of the writer, 'it *became* Him, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Author of their salvation perfect through sufferings.' Whatever the death of Christ may signify, it does not mean an expedient for quenching the wrath of God, or for buying off man from His vengeance. This was a gain for religion greater than mind can calculate."

The Atonement satisfies the demands of justice. The majesty of law must be sustained and the demands of justice met, or we would have anarchy in the state. Brutus felt this when he put to death his own sons for treason to the Roman Republic. God certainly felt this when he banished from his presence the angels that kept not their first estate (Jude 6). This does not detract from the love of God, for the fallen angels would have disturbed even the peace of heaven itself. Man's conduct may be such that the welfare of society requires his separation from it, and this separation may not be injurious even to the man himself. The Atonement satisfies the demands of justice; so that God could be just, and at the same time extend the blessings of salvation to man. While the idea of reconciling God to man has been carried to a great extreme, and has given an improper conception of the character of God, still it has in it some important elements of truth.

While it is true that man's personal sins could not be transferred to Christ, it is still very evident that he endured chastisement for us. Without this intervention, sin would have forever crushed man's hope. While Lady Macbeth had learned to hate her crime, she was not able to wash the blood from her hands. A man may hate his crime one minute after committing it, but he cannot of himself get rid of the stains. We ought to learn that when some things are done, they cannot be undone. We may obtain pardon through the atoning blood of Christ; still the fact remains that the deed was committed. Macbeth will never be made to think that the murder should have been. Personal demerit is not transferable from one person to another, but one can endure chastisement for the sins of another. While Christ died to satisfy the demands of justice, he did not become a murderer or a perjurer in order to take away the sin of the world.

It is said that Bronson Alcott, christianized his school by enduring chastisement in the place of a pupil. The boy struck the master once, and then burst into tears. Professor Anderson, of Grayson College, Texas, endured similar punishment in the place of a student, and the student ever felt humiliated in the fact that he had thus

struck his teacher. There is something philosophic in the Bible view of the Atonement. There is something very profound in the subject of the Atonement found in the fifty-third chapter of the prophecy of Isaiah. It is not surprising that a careful study of this chapter converted an eminent English skeptic.

The Atonement reconciles man to God. It is such a powerful manifestation of God's love that it reaches the very heart of man. Those who remain unmoved by the love of God shown in the Atonement Christ made for the salvation of man, are certainly beyond redemption. The Atonement in reconciling man to God may be illustrated. Suppose all the boys, save one, of a large family, leave home and go to a distant country. They finally settle in an important city of that country. The city itself becomes a Sodom, and the boys are taken in by the city. They are rapidly going to ruin, and the father learns of their wretched condition. He finally sends his only remaining son to save his brethren. He visits them in the city of vice and pestilence, and finally dies of the disease himself. His brethren fully understand the fact that he has given his life to save them from their sins. They become thoroughly penitent, and return to their father's house. We have such an example in the mission of the Christ to this world. God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself. The Atonement appeals to the highest nature of man. (See the author's *Macrocosmus*.)

The true view of the Atonement contains both profound philosophy and theology. In it true philosophy and true theology harmonize. Both make manifest the freedom of Christ in dying for the sin of the world. The following language of Dr. Fairbairn is appropriate just here: "The entrance of this voluntary element modifies the whole conception, changes the death from a martyrdom to a sacrifice. The martyr is not a willing sufferer, he is the victim of superior force. He dies because others so will. He might be able to purchase a pardon by recantation, did his conscience allow him to recant; but conscience is not the cause of his death, only a condition for the action of those who inflict it. He does not choose death; death, as it were, chooses him. But sacrifice is possible only

where there is perfect freedom—where a man surrenders what he has both the right and power to withhold. Now Jesus here speaks of His act as a free act; He came, not simply to suffer at the hands of violent men, but to do a certain thing ‘Give his life.’ The terms that describe the ministry and the death are co-ordinate, freedom enters in the same measure into both; as He came to minister He came to give His life, the spontaneity in both cases being equal and identical.”

The New Theology and Comparative Religion

The New Theology views all religions from the standpoint of Evolution, and this naturally led to a careful comparison of the origin and progress of all the religions of the world. It is perfectly safe to state that Christianity has greatly gained from this comparison. At the Parliament of all religions at Chicago it was not difficult for the unbiased student to see the infinite superiority of Christianity to all the other great religions of the world. Buddhism and Mohammedanism are really the only religions that claim to rival Christianity on the great questions of universality, and adaptation to all the races of men.

Buddhism and Christianity

The object of its worship is the ultimate principle which determines the character of a religion. When we study a religion the first thing we want to know is what it teaches about God. It is therefore natural for comparative religionists to thoroughly test Buddhism on this point. Some claim that Buddha was a theist; others think that he was practically an agnostic. The following language of Dr. A. M. Fairbairn, in his *Philosophy of Religion* will be read with interest: “Buddhism has been cited as an illustration how a highly and potential ethical faith can exist not only without a personal God, but even without any deity whatever. Such citation, however, is essentially incorrect; for nothing could be farther than the soul or system of the Buddha from what we mean by atheism.

He indeed denied both the pantheistic and polytheistic Brahmanisms of his day, with the authority of the sacred books on which they were based, the social distinctions by which they were justified, and the customs by which they were guarded and enforced; but to turn this denial into the affirmation of an atheism is a feat of the most inconsequent logic. We maintain, on the contrary, that his denial was the expression of a thoroughly theistic consciousness."

Buddha was the founder of a missionary religion, yet it was essentially Hindoo in its character. As it came from the Buddha, it was more of an evolution than a revolution. Buddha was a Hindoo and had all the dread of his race of the evils of transmigration. It was to escape from constant rebirths and deaths that he determined to find a more excellent way. The way of the Brahmans was to him too long and uncertain, so he determined to separate himself from the world and seek enlightenment. He became a philosopher. It was in this way that the noble Gautama became Buddha, or the enlightened. When he had completely mastered himself and had attained Nirvana, he began to preach to others what he believed to be the truth. After his death his disciples interpreted him from a transcendental standpoint, and he became an object of worship. After his apotheosis his disciples went everywhere preaching the gospel of Buddhism.

Dr. Fairbairn thus contrasts Buddha with Christ: "(I) Buddha is a pessimist; he does not love life, for to him being is suffering, and his desire is to escape from sorrow by escaping from existence. But Christ is never a pessimist; His very passion is the expression of a splendid optimism, the belief that existence is so good that it ought not to be lost but held fast and rescued, and when purged from the accident of sin will become altogether lovely, a thing to be wholly desired. (II.) Buddha is a leader, a man to be followed and imitated; what he did men must do that they may partake in his illumination and enter into his rest. But what Christ does no other person can do. He offers Himself a Sacrifice that He may win eternal redemption for men. (III.) Buddha

is an Indian ascetic, whose highest work is to break the bonds of life and all the forces which make for its continuance and for the social perfecting of the race. But Christ is in the strict sense a Redeemer and a Sacrifice, one whose sorrow is curative, who restores our nature to social and personal health, that it may attain individual and collective happiness, personal and general immortality. (IV.) The basis of Buddha's salvation is a metaphysical nihilism. In a world without God and immortality, but crowded with men of teachable moral natures, redemption is not difficult, instruction can accomplish it, the meditation which found the way can be followed until the goal is reached. But in a world where God cannot cease to be pure and man cannot will himself out of existence, to make the guilty man fit to be reconciled with the pure and eternal God is a work which may well cause suffering to the holiest and most blessed Being. The world which Christ redeems is one of infinite reality, man being in his own degree as real as God. The Passion, then, has a singular character and unique worth; it stands alone, without any parallels in the other religions of history."

Mohammedanism and Christianity

Mohammedanism is another missionary religion which had a personal founder. Dr. Fairbairn says: "Mohammed divides with Buddha and the Brahman the religious sovereignty of the Oriental mind, yet the sovereignties are in idea, in type, and in form worlds apart. All three are rooted in religion, but the faith of the Brahman is a polytheism so multitudinous and tolerant as to include everything that men may call deity, if only the deity will consent to be included and to be respectful to those who dwelt in the pantheon before him. The sovereignty of Buddha is that of the ideal man and the idealized pity, which, without concern or care for any god, draws humanity towards the dreamless beatitude he has himself attained; while Mohammed's is strictly derivative and representative, due to his being the one sufficient and authoritative spokesman of the one Merciful and Al-

mighty God. The Brahman's sovereignty is social and heritable, came to him by the blood which defined his place and function in society as well as his office before the gods and on behalf of men; but both Buddha's and Mohammed's may be described as in a sense personal, though it was acquired by the one through his own efforts, achievements, and merits, and granted to the other by the will and deed of his god. The sovereignty of the Brahman is expressed in the society he has organized, the system at once natural and artificial, of caste; while Buddha's is expressed in a society whose orders correspond to his theory of merit, and Mohammed's is a brotherhood where all are equal before a God too great to know any respecter of persons. The image, or symbol, of his god which the Brahman loves is to Mohammed but a shameful and empty idol, while the statue which the Buddhist reveres speaks to him of a still more graceless idolatry, the supersession of the uncreated God by the created man, he had appointed to be his minister. But though his sovereignty is not represented to the eye by any image, it yet had a fitter and more imperious symbol, a book which reveals the mind of God and proclaims the law which man is bound under the most awful and inexorable sanctions to obey. The worship it enjoins is one of stern yet majestic simplicity; it concerns God only, and there is but the one God who has made Mohammed his final and sovereign prophet, and declared through him that all idols are 'idleness and vanity.' "

I cannot agree with those who regard Mohammed as only an impostor. His early life shows the greatest sincerity. His early disciples had the greatest confidence in his divine mission. The Koran is a book which contains much truth and is worthy of careful study. It presents pure theism in its most rigid form; still it did much to destroy idolatry. It is doubtless true that Mohammed was largely indebted to the Jewish and Christian Scriptures for his theistic ideas. Be that as it may, his convictions were intense and he and his disciples manifested true Semitic zeal in their efforts to destroy idolatry. While the prophet was thoroughly sincere in his religious views and the importance of their propaga-

tion, still with all his zeal he could not convert the Arabian tribes. Realizing this fact he adopted a method which led to the spiritual fall of the prophet. When he took the sword his greatness as a religious teacher forever departed. He conquered a great part of Asia and Africa; and even to this day his followers hold by the sword much beautiful territory in Eastern Europe. His religion is despotism in both Church and State. He took the sword and his disciples followed the example of their master. What a marvelous contrast indeed is this to the teaching and practice of the Christ and his apostles.

The miracles of the Christ have a sanity that does not belong to the pretended miracles of other great founders of religions. While the Christ transcended nature, his works were never unnatural. He always seemed to work through the very nature he transcended. Buddha has been compared to Christ. Those who have read the history of Buddhism know how unnatural were the miracles ascribed to him compared with the miracles recorded in the New Testament. For example his giving his body to be eaten by a hungry lion is thoroughly unnatural. There really seems to be a tendency on the part of the religious visionary imagination to create the unnatural and the distorted. It has been said that Mohammedanism has no miracles. This is a mistake; its whole history is one of distorted miracles. The Koran is regarded by them as the greatest of miracles. When we compare the miracles claimed by the monks of the middle ages with those of the gospels, we find the one thoroughly unreasonable and unnatural; and the other we find thoroughly reasonable, and exactly what we would naturally expect of the Christ. The saneness of Christ's miracles commend them to the greatest thinkers in the world.

Christ was the only great religious founder who had a perfectly sinless life. The life of Buddha was abnormal. He left his family and became an anchorite. He thought that he was doing the divine will, but we would consider it a crime. The monks of the Middle Ages imitated the life of Buddha, and not the life of Christ. Christ did not live or teach the life of an ascetic. Mohammed became a

polygamist, and when he became a warrior he certainly became a sensualist also. We would not be using terms too strong, if, after he became a conqueror, we called him both a murderer and a sensualist. What a marvelous contrast between his life and that of the sinless life of Jesus! There were good and pure men in the Old Testament, but none entirely free from sin. Even the pious Isaiah felt heavily the burden of sin resting upon him. The Old Testament worthies seemed to forshadow the sinless life of the Messiah. The Evangelists without any effort, in a perfectly natural way, let the sinless life of Christ unfold itself. Both Pilate and his wife were unable to find any fault in him. Judas Iscariot confessed that he had betrayed innocent blood. The centurion who watched at the sepulcher declared Jesus to be the Son of God. Paul, who long persecuted, finally acknowledged Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of the living God.

Jesus was the only founder of a great religion, who completely transcended his environment. Buddha has been called, "The Light of Asia," and I am not inclined to dispute the compliment. He was certainly a great reformer, and his religion has doubtless been an important light in the Orient. But Buddhism is strictly an Asiatic religion; and all efforts to propagate it in the Occident have been consummate failures. Buddha could not transcend his environment. Mohammedanism has been called a universal religion, and it has doubtless been an important light to certain portions of Asia and Africa. It must, however, be admitted that Islamism has never made much progress where Mohammedan's arms have not triumphed. It is strictly an Arabic religion, and Mohammed could not transcend his environment. The same thing can be said of Judaism; it could not transcend its environment. How different indeed has it been with Christianity. It has completely transcended its environment. No one ever thinks of it as an Oriental religion. It has shown itself to be perfectly adapted to the Occident as well as to the Orient. The reason of this is the fact that the Founder of Christianity entirely transcended his environment.

The Christ was the only founder of a great religion

who required a change of heart on the part of those who would be his disciples. Buddha, it is true, required those who wished to reach Nirvana to separate themselves from the world, and live the life of monks, but this is a very different thing from a change of heart. Men left their families and retired to the woods to spend their time in thought and idleness. Jesus required his disciples to live in the world and let their light shine. Mohammed required of his disciples nothing that we call a change of heart. Whenever conquered races would acknowledge the existence of one God and that Mohammed was his prophet, that settled the matter. They were at once taken into the arms of the faithful disciples of the Prophet. It was entirely different with Christ and his apostles. John, the Baptist, who came to prepare the way of the Lord, preached repentance to the people. After the imprisonment of John, Jesus came into Galilee preaching the same thing. Jesus told Nicodemus, the Jewish ruler, that unless he was born again he could not enter into the Kingdom of God. Paul teaches that all who truly become the disciples of Christ, are a new creation. To them all things become new; they look upon life from a different standpoint. Christ requires a change of heart.

Jesus was the only founder of a great religion, who presented to his disciples a perfect model of worship. Some distinguished critics think that Buddha was an atheist. I do not think this, but he was certainly not definite enough on the divine existence. He was worshipped after his death by his disciples, but they worshipped only a good man. The disciples of Christ worship the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation. While the Mohammedans were taught to worship Allah, they worshipped him according to the dictates of Mohammed. Islamism consequently degenerated into a servile following of all the commands of the Arabian prophet. The consequence is that they think they are doing God's service when they are slaughtering their enemies. Very different, indeed, is the object of the Christians' worship. They worship God through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Such worship lifts man to the highest plane of life possible in this world.

CHAPTER XVI

THE CONTRIBUTION OF PHILOSOPHY TO THE HIGHER CRITICISM

What is called The Higher Criticism is the outgrowth of the German Critical Philosophy. It has applied the same method to nearly all ancient literature. A distinction should always be made between the higher criticism and destructive criticism. A criticism of the text of Scripture is called the lower criticism, and an inquiry into the origin of the Bible is called the higher criticism. The higher criticism is really an historical science. Infidels take hold of this as they do of all other sciences, and try to push it into skepticism. This skeptical tendency is what we call destructive criticism. Christians can no more afford to let infidels control the higher criticism than they can afford to let them control any other science.

Who Wrote the Pentateuch?

In the last chapter of Luke, Christ, in referring to the Old Testament, calls it "the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms." By the "Psalms" was meant all the poetical books; the prophets included the rest of the Old Testament except the Pentateuch. This name has been applied to the first five books of the Bible ever since the days of Origen. Nehemiah certainly refers to it as the law, or the book of the law (Neh. viii, 1-3; xiii, 1). In the Septuagint it is divided into separate books; but how long this was done before this translation was made, we do not know. Josephus, in his work against Apion, mentions the five books of Moses as divine, and says that they contain his laws and the traditions of the origin of mankind until his death. This position was almost universally accepted until after the Reformation.

In the seventeenth century, bold attacks began to be made upon the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. It was assailed by the philosopher Hobbs in his "Leviathan"; by the philosopher Spinoza in his "Tracts"; and by Richard Simon, the Roman Catholic, in his "Critical History of the Old Testament." In 1780, Eichhorn wrote his noted "Introduction to the Old Testament," in which he employed the methods of the higher criticism. He claimed that Moses used different documents in his work; but held firmly to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, except certain editorial notes afterwards added. The scholarly and critical Eichhorn was not far wrong in this position.

Bishop Colenso wrote a critical work on the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, which failed to attract attention in England; but it seems to have inspired Kuenen to write his *destructive works* which deny the supernatural in the Bible. The gifted Wellhausen also carried his *destructive methods* to a great extreme. The scholarly Dillman opposed the extreme view of both Kuenen and Wellhausen, and maintained that the Bible contains a revelation from God. Dr. Driver, and other English scholars of the higher critics, are firm believers in the supernatural element in the Bible, and there now seems to be quite a reaction against the extreme tendency of the destructive critics.

I have given a good deal of attention to the investigation of this subject, and I am satisfied that a good deal of concession will have to be made to the higher critics. It is evident to every candid critic that the Pentateuch was edited by the insertion of notes after it left the hands of Moses. A good example of this is found in Gen. xxxvi, 31. Ezra made verbal explanations of the recovered law of Moses after the Babylonian exile. He doubtless annotated the Pentateuch, and did for it in writing what he had done orally. This explains, to my mind, many of the peculiarities which are supposed to indicate a post-Mosaic origin for the Pentateuch. It must also be conceded that Moses probably used different documents in the composition of the Book of Genesis. It may also be admitted that there is really a basis for

many of the distinctions drawn between the book of the covenant, the priest-code, and the Deuteronomic code. I cannot see how even these distinctions can destroy the evidence in favor of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The destructive critics have long maintained that "Elohim" and "Jehovah" are sufficient evidence of different authors. But it is a fact that before the days of Moses the Egyptians used these names for the Deity; and Egyptologists claim that they frequently applied a great variety of names to the same Deity. See the author's *Macrocosmus*.

The Pentateuch testifies to the fact that Moses was its author, with the exception of additions made by a later writer. The historical books of the Old Testament point to Moses as the author of the Pentateuch. The prophetic books also seem to testify to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The poetic books of the Old Testament clearly assume that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. Christ and the apostles clearly endorse the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Whatever additions may have been made by a redactor, or editor, with the facts before us, I do not see how any thoughtful critic can deny the fact that Moses himself was sufficiently responsible for the Pentateuch for the great work to bear his name. As I say that Homer was the author of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, so I do not hesitate to say that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch.

The new science of archaeology sustains this position. During the past twenty-five years this new science has made wonderful revelations; and in nothing more wonderful than the support it gives to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. This new science has also developed some of the greatest scholars in the world; and many of them are certainly not inferior to any belonging to the school of the higher critics. The destructive critics claim that all religions originated in fetishism, then developed into polytheism, and from polytheism into monotheism. Archaeology clearly places limitations upon this position. Many of the leading archaeologists claim that monotheism was taught in Egypt at least two thousand years before Christ. Egyptologists are perfectly

agreed that monotheism was established as the religion of the state for a time, at least, during the eighteenth dynasty.

It is evident from archaeology that the Egyptians, the Assyrians, and the Babylonians had reached a high state of civilization fifteen or twenty centuries before the Christian era. In fact, Egypt was a well-organized monarchy three thousand years before Christ. Its religion was established, and it possessed a language and written characters. The same thing can be said of the Babylonians and Assyrians. Recent discoveries show constant written intercourse between Egypt and Syria. These nations made considerable progress in astronomy, and particularly in some of the fine arts. In the history of art, special attention is given to Egyptian art. In some respects, the ancient Egyptians were considered masters. It is true that its art perished with the despotism that gave it birth, but it certainly had some very high qualities.

It appears plain to me that historic science supports the position that the Pentateuch was written during the golden age of Hebrew literature, and not in the times of the Persian kings. The Pentateuch is written in a simple style, and its poems are pure and lofty. Some of them bear great likeness to early Egyptian poetry; and we know that Moses was thoroughly educated in Egypt. Moses lived exactly at the right time to have produced just such a work as the Pentateuch. It was the golden age of Egyptian and Asiatic literature.

The Christology of the Pentateuch

Dr. Charles A. Briggs calls Hebrew prophecy an organism of redemption. It centers around the coming Messiah. In fact, the Old Testament is largely a prophecy. The Montanistic theory of Hebrew prophecy has brought reproach upon it, and has tended to injure its true value. This theory makes the prophets only passive instruments in the hands of the Holy Spirit; and it looks for a literal fulfilment of all their predictions. Such, however, is not always the case; for Hebrew prophecy is largely a foreshadowing of the whole scheme of redemption.

The predictive prophecy of the Old Testament presents divine ideals above the powers of man to originate. It would not have been possible for man by his own ability alone to have presented in type the whole scheme of redemption. Kuenen has used the Montanistic theory in order to disprove the truth of all predictive prophecy. His extreme naturalistic theory requires him to set aside in some way all facts that point to the supernatural. All the blows of this great destructive critic cannot destroy the important facts and high ideals of Hebrew prediction. We do not expect a perfect correspondence between type and antitype; for the anti-type must transcend the type as the ideal transcends the form which presents it.

The Messianic ideal is the central theme of all Hebrew prophecy. This ideal starts with Genesis and continues to the completion of the Old Testament. We first find it in the Adamic family. Adam was a figure of him who was to come; and the divine image would be restored and completed in the second Adam. In him the seed of the woman would completely bruise the serpent's head. The Adamic race became so depraved that the progress of civilization required its removal, and the divine promise was confined to the family of Noah, who was himself a type of the Christ. The descendants of Noah became so thoroughly corrupt that the call of Abraham became a necessity, in order to carry out the promise made to Adam. The call of Abraham in the twelfth chapter of Genesis, shows clearly that in his posterity the Messianic ideal was to be fulfilled, and that all nations were to be blessed through the coming Messiah. When we read this interesting narrative, which gives such a graphic description of the patriarchs and their families, how positively absurd, indeed, does appear the mythical theory of the destructive critics, which claims that such persons never lived.

When Moses was sent to Pharaoh, Jehovah directed him to release Israel, who was God's first born, and in case he did not release him, his first born would be slain. See Ex. 4th Chapter. In Ex. 19th chapter, Israel is called a kingdom of priests, and holy nation. The Messianic ideal passes from that of the tribe to that of the

nation. Balak, king of Moab, employed Balaam to curse Israel. Balaam was a prophet outside of Israel; and although the king took him upon three mountain tops, he continued to bless Israel, each time in stronger terms. The fourth time he completely discomfited Balak in the marvelous Messianic prediction of the conquering star. The Bible here recognizes a correct prophecy outside of the bounds of Israel. In the great book of Deuteronomy, Moses clearly recognizes the coming of a prophet like unto himself. Moses was himself a type of the Messiah, and many of his own predictions were very similar to those afterwards made by the Christ. In the third chapter of Acts, Simon Peter declares the fact that Jesus was the prophet like unto Moses.

Who Wrote the Psalms?

The majority of the critics admit that David was the principal author of the Psalms. The apostle Peter, on the day of Pentecost, quotes from the sixteenth and the one hundred and tenth psalms as the work of David. Internal evidence plainly points to him as the writer of many others. The ninetieth psalm was written by Moses, and it is thought by able critics that Solomon composed the first psalm. It is quite certain that he composed the seventy-second and the one hundred and twenty-seventh psalms.

Mr. Gladstone says that John Bright told him that he would be willing to risk the question of Divine Revelation upon the Book of Psalms. When we consider the age in which the psalms were produced, we are the more deeply impressed with the inspiration of their authors. In Ephesians 5th chapter and in Colossians 3rd chapter, Paul exhorts Christians to praise God in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. The psalms are always placed first. The value of the psalms will be still further understood when we consider the fact that the writers of the New Testament quote from the Book of Psalms more frequently than they do from any other book of the Old Testament. Many of the psalms transcend the Mosaic law, and point to the new law that went forth from Zion and the word

of the Lord from Jerusalem. It is claimed that some of the psalms breathe hatred towards enemies, when Jesus the Christ, plainly teaches that we should love our enemies. It should be remembered that these imprecations are against the enemies of Jehovah. It is also a fact that the true nature of God was not fully understood until the Incarnation of the Christ. When professed Christians have committed crimes against their enemies, they have been the worshippers of the God of the Old Testament instead of the God of the New. In other words, they did not understand the full nature of God as revealed in the Christ.

The Christology of the Psalms

The second and one hundred and tenth psalms are clearly Messianic, and they present different phases of Messiah's reign. Our Saviour himself in Matt. 22: 41-46, plainly states that David was the author of the 110th psalm. David called the Messiah Lord, and as Jesus argued with the Pharisees, this made him something more than simply the son of David. This psalm is not like other Messianic psalms, typical, but it is directly prophetic of the Messiah. The apostle Peter so uses it on the day of Pentecost. This majestic psalm sets forth in the most beautiful lines the coming Messiah. While Solomon sat on David's throne, he did not sit at the right hand of Jehovah. This was reserved for the Messiah alone. This Messiah was to be after the order of Melchizedek, both king and priest; and he was thus to transcend any king or priest belonging to the Jewish nation.

The seventy-second Psalm is regarded by many of the leading higher critics as Messianic. It doubtless refers directly to Solomon, who was a type of Christ, and predicts the character of his reign. This reign of peace foreshadowed the Messianic king, who was himself to be the Prince of Peace. As Solomon received gifts from many nations, so the Messiah would sit upon David's throne receiving the homage of the nations.

The forty-fifth Psalm is quite generally received as Messianic. It graphically describes the Messianic king

as the Godly bridegroom, and the nations as part of the Church, as the bride. The first verse is an introduction, in which the author, with the pen of a ready writer, tells what he is going to say touching the king. In verses from two to nine he, in a very sublime way, describes the king. In verses ten to fifteen, he addresses the bride in reference to her duties to the bridegroom. The conclusion is composed of two verses, in which the writer describes the fortunes of the king's family. This beautiful psalm certainly points directly to the Messiah, for its ideals cannot be found anywhere else. It is fulfilled in Christ, the bridegroom, and the Church, the bride.

The eighteenth Psalm is clearly Messianic, and it is one of the most beautiful of all the psalms. David was certainly its author, for it really seems to be his personal experience. The Messianic element appears in its idealized experience. Through the Messiah, David's throne is exalted, and triumphs in all the earth.

The sixteenth is a Messianic Psalm, in which the ideal man is perfect in this life, constantly enjoying the favor of God, and in sweet communion with God after death. He completely triumphs over death. In the history of the world, we search in vain for such a man until we come to the life of Christ. He was perfect, for in him dwelt all the fulness of God. He was perfect from the manward as well as the Godward side. He was the Son of Man, as well as the Son of God.

Who Wrote Jonah?

The book does not mention its author, but the prophet certainly left a manuscript of his marvelous career. Canon Driver says: "No doubt the materials of the narrative were supplied to the author by tradition, and rest ultimately upon a basis of fact. No doubt the outlines of the narrative are historical, and Jonah's preaching was actually successful at Nineveh," (Luke II: 30-32.)

Jonah was the son of Amittai, and prophesied during the reign of Jereboam the Second, king of Israel (2 Ki. XIV: 25). The names of Jonah and Amittai occur nowhere else in the Old Testament, and the Book of Jonah can

consequently refer to no other person. The word Jonah means "dove," and while the dove-like element in his nature sometimes fled, he was nevertheless a prophet of the Lord. The light in which Jonah places himself makes it evident that he was, at least, the author of the outlines of the narrative. No other Jewish writer would have placed the prophet in such an unfavorable light. Jonah does not hesitate to place before posterity his own mistakes, and showing the fearful consequences in disobeying the command of God. While Jonah was doubtless the author of a manuscript, containing the outlines of the narrative, a later prophet evidently placed it in its present shape. We should remember that there was a school of the prophets, and that they very carefully guarded the sacred literature of the Hebrews. I am fully convinced that the Book of Jonah was given by inspiration of God. It is rather strange that the Book which contains the most sublime revelation recorded in the Old Testament, should mostly be known on account of its connection with a whale.

Even Canon Driver admits that the Book of Jonah was founded upon actual history. Our Saviour in Matt. XII: 39-41, refers to it as historical in character. If Solomon and the Queen of Sheba were historical in the days of Christ, the same thing can be said of Jonah. We urge the following objections to the rationalistic position: It seems largely designed to get rid of the supernatural in the book. No one can accept the Bible as divine authority and reject the supernatural. There is nothing in the Book of Jonah more difficult than the resurrection of Christ. (2) On the ground of simply an allegory, we cannot explain Jonah's prayer in the second chapter. (3) It is hardly probable that a writer of fiction would have selected a real prophet, whose actual home is mentioned in the Bible. (4) The book would not have found its way into the sacred canon if it had only been a work of fiction. (5) Christ certainly endorsed the work as having an historical basis. In one sense nearly all the Old Testament may be considered parabolic, for Paul certainly makes it such; so we may consider the Book of Jonah parabolic history, and this is the *golden mean* between extreme views on the subject.

The Christology of Jonah

Jonah was a type of Christ. His name signifies dove, which represents the meek and gentle spirit of Jesus. Jonah was not a perfect type of Christ, for his dove-like nature sometimes forsook him. When Jesus was baptized of John in the Jordan, the Holy Spirit descended upon him in the shape of a dove (Matt. III: 26). Jonah was a type of Christ as a prophet; it was his mission to proclaim the will of God. He was a preacher of repentance; Christ taught the people to repent, and prepare for the coming kingdom.

Jonah represented our Saviour in his sufferings and deliverance. He was willing to be cast into the sea; Christ died voluntarily for the sin of the world. In Jonah's sufferings we have represented the terrible agony of Christ in Gethsemane, and upon the cross at Calvary. Jonah's preservation was a type of the resurrection of Christ from among the dead. The Book of Jonah has in it the supernatural; but its miracle is no greater than that of the resurrection of Christ. In Biology, and particularly in Embryology, we find great mysteries connected with life. If such be the case in the system of nature; we certainly must expect the supernatural in the system of redemption. God is in nature, and God is in the scheme of redemption.

Who Wrote Isaiah?

Philosophy contributed to Theology the theory of the non-Isaian authorship of chapters from XL-LXVI of the work ascribed to him. It was started by Koppe, a disciple of German Rationalistic Philosophy. He may have received the hint from Aben Ezra, a Jewish writer of the twelfth century, who was the first to suggest it. It is based upon two arguments: (1) That the author of chapters XL-LXVI takes his standpoint during the Babylonian captivity; (2) That this author had a knowledge of Cyrus, which the prophet Isaiah could not possibly have had. This discussion is mostly a literary one, and it does not seriously affect the true value of the book.

It is much like the controversy in reference to the composite character of the Iliad and the Odyssey. While an inspired editor may have made some changes in, and added something to, the original manuscript of Isaiah, I can not otherwise than regard the book as a practical unity.

The following argument seems to sufficiently substantiate the unity of the book: (1) The Septuagint ascribes the book as a whole to Isaiah the son of Amoz. On the other hand the Septuagint translators recognized the composite nature of the Book of Psalms. (2) The author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, who lived nearly two hundred years B. C. ascribes the disputed portion to Isaiah. (3) The same literary ability is acknowledged in reference to the disputed chapters as in the chapters considered by all as genuine. (4) The greatest critics have acknowledged a similarity of language and construction in all parts of the Book. (5) The whole Book also shows a similarity in images and rhetorical figures. (6) The use of the images of light and darkness through the whole Book are very remarkable, if we entirely discard its unity. (7) There are certain characteristic expressions throughout the whole Book, which certainly point to unity. For example such expressions as "The Holy One of Israel," "The mouth of the Lord has spoken it," and many others. I am perfectly willing to give the redactor credit for all he did; but it would certainly be unfair to give him credit for the composition that probably belongs to Isaiah, the son of Amoz.

The Christology of Isaiah

In the second chapter and third verse the prophet states that the law shall go forth out of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. This scripture is certainly Messianic; for in Luke xxiv: 47, Christ, himself, applies it to the beginning of His Great Commission on the Day of Pentecost. The Branch of the Lord of chapter fourth and verse second is also Messianic. The Messiah is to come to the delight of his people, and those constituting his kingdom are to be purified from evil works and constitute a holy people unto the Lord.

The Book of Isaiah studied in connection with the New Testament will convince any candid student that Isaiah was inspired to predict the future. Even the most extreme of the Higher Critics admit that it is highly Messianic. In the Seventh Chapter Immanuel, God with us, certainly points forward to the Messiah. It is applied by Matthew to the Christ. In the Eighth Chapter, the Messiah is called the Prince of Peace; and Matthew also used this to show that Jesus was the Messiah. The Eleventh Chapter of Isaiah calls the Messiah a Twig from the stump of Jesse, which would be fruitful forever. In the Nineteenth Chapter, the prophet teaches that even Egypt and Assyria, the ancient enemies of Israel, would be united with Israel under the Messiah. The Twenty-eighth Chapter calls the Messiah the Precious Corner Stone, and the New Testament writers apply this to Jesus, the Christ. In the Thirty-third Chapter we have a beautiful description of Zion, as the City of the Great King. W. R. Smith, in his *Prophet of Israel*, says: "In this most beautiful of all Isaiah's discourses the long conflict of Israel's sin with Jehovah's righteousness is left behind; peace, forgiveness, and holy joy breathes in every verse, and the dark colours of present and past distress serve only as a foil to the assured felicity that is ready to dawn on Jehovah's land." The prophet Micah, who was contemporary with Isaiah, still further confirms the truth of the predictions of the great prophet. In his Fifth Chapter, he plainly teaches that the Messiah should be born in Bethlehem of Judea. This chapter was quoted by the wise men, in answer to the question of the Eastern Magis to the place where the Messiah should be born.

It is claimed by the Higher Critics that Isaiah chapters 40-66 were written by a prophet of the Exile, who is called the great unknown. I do not know how much of it was written by a later prophet than Isaiah; but I do know that it was written by the greatest of the prophets. It practically makes little difference whether it was written by Isaiah, or a prophet of the Exile, for it is highly Messianic in character. This is freely admitted by all the Higher Critics themselves, who are not pronounced infidels. Chapters LII: 13-LIII describe the suffering Messiah in

language almost as plain as the language of the Evangelists themselves. The Expositors' Bible says: "We have now exhausted the passages in Isa. XI-LXVI, which deal with the Servant of the Lord. We have found that our prophet identifies him at first with the whole nation, and then with some indefinite portion of the nation—indefinite in quantity, but most marked in character; that this personification grows more and more difficult to distinguish from a person; and that chapters LII: 13-LIII, there are very strong reasons, both in the text itself and in the analogy of prophecy to suppose that the portrait of an individual is intended." Philip in preaching to the Ethiopian treasurer took his text from the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, and from this Scripture preached to this officer Jesus.

Who Wrote Daniel?

The Book of Daniel was a new departure from the literature of the Hebrews; it is the earliest example of Apocalypse, and, in fact, the only example found in the Old Testament. Like prophecy the Apocalypse had to do with the future. It differs from prophecy in the fact that the writer had nothing to do with the moral condition of the times in which he wrote. The Apocalyptist regarded the future without speaking special words of warning. He delivered his message in prose and not in the lyric style of the prophet.

The position of Dean Farrar and others that the Book of Daniel is a religious novel written in the times of the Maccabees is objectionable for the following reasons: (1) Nebuchadnezzar was totally unlike Antiochus Epiphanes. (2) The historic facts in the life of Nebuchadnezzar do not correspond to those of Antiochus. (3) The conduct of the great Babylonian towards Daniel was entirely different from the conduct of Antiochus toward the Jews. (4) The influence of the Book of Daniel can only be understood on the ground that it gives an account of real events. (5) The fact that one portion is written in Chaldee and the other portion in Hebrew is against the idea of a religious novel.

It appears to me that both the traditionalists and critics have gone to extremes in discussing the genuineness and authenticity of the Book of Daniel. The golden mean is the safer position. Some of the critics have certainly gone to great extremes. I have always been interested in the writings of Dean Farrar, but it appears that he lost his head in discussing the Book of Daniel. He seems to have surrendered completely to the infidel Porphyry. If his position is correct then Daniel should be dropped from the sacred canon as Luther wanted to drop the Book of James.

I am inclined to the view that Daniel wrote separate tracts; and that in some cases he wrote in Hebrew for the Jews alone, and in others in Chaldee for the people at large. After this a prophet, editor, possibly during the Captivity, arranged all in the form of one book, and this, of course, gave unity to the work. This position explains why one portion was written in Hebrew and the other in Chaldee. I am not dogmatic, but this position appears to me the most reasonable.

The Christology of Daniel

The second chapter of the Book of Daniel is Christological. The universal empires therein described are contrasted with the Universal Kingdom of the Messiah. The Stone cut out of the mountain was the Rock of Ages. Its spirit that right makes might will triumph over all the kingdoms governed by the principle that might makes right. If the position of the Higher Critics, that Daniel was written in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes is established, it cannot destroy the Christological value of the Book. From this standpoint alone the Book of Daniel is of very great value.

The Seventy Weeks of the Ninth Chapter of Daniel are certainly Messianic. These weeks were determined upon Israel for the following purposes: (1) To restrain the transgression. Israel did much to prevent the universal spread of idolatry. (2) To seal or shut up sins. (3) To cover iniquity. The typical blood of the Old Covenant covered up iniquity until the blood of Christ

cleansed from all sin. (4) To introduce everlasting righteousness. (5) To confirm and rectify vision and prophecy. At the end of the *seventy weeks*, the prophecies of the Old Covenant were to be fulfilled by the introduction of the Gospel Dispensation. (6) To anoint the Most Holy. This, doubtless, refers to the Christ who was to be anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows.

The seventy weeks are, of course, figurative. According to Ezekiel iv: 6 a day is put for a year. The seventy weeks of Daniel are divided into three subordinate periods as follows: seven weeks, sixty-two weeks, and one week. The one week, according to Ezekiel, represents seven years. We learn from the prophet that at the end of half a seven of years the Messiah was to cause the sacrifice and offerings to cease. The ministry of Christ lasted three and a half years; so we find a perfect correspondence between prophecy and history. The death of Christ for sin abolished all the typical sacrifices of the law. The Messiah was cut off in the midst of the heptade. Christ preached one half of the period, and the gospel was specially preached to the Jews the other half. They rejected it, and the work then especially began among the Gentiles. We next have from the prophet a clear indication of the overthrow of Jerusalem by the Gentiles. The Romans, under Titus, completely destroyed the city. The more I study this chapter the more I am convinced that God was in the Book of Daniel. All the Higher Critics agree that the book was written centuries before the Christian era. The Messianic nature of this ninth chapter can no more be explained away than can the references to the Messiah in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.

The Contribution of Philosophy to the Higher Criticism of the New Testament

The greatest philosopher contributing to the Higher Criticism of the New Testament was David Friederich Strauss. The following are his main positions: (1) He insists that a portion of the New Testament is mythical. The great question that seemed before his mind seems to

have been the question of the truth or falsehood of miracles. He thought that the natural events in the New Testament were in the main true, but that the supernatural events were false. (2) Strauss claims that the books of the New Testament were written in the last half of the second century by unknown writers, and not by the apostles and their companions. (3) He accounts for the supernatural events of the New Testament in the following way: The infant church believed in the Messiahship of Jesus, and thought that he must have wrought such miracles as are recorded in the Old Testament in reference to the prophets. He thus makes the Jewish belief in miracles the basis of the belief in miracles by the disciples of Christ. (4) He thinks that the writers of these myths were self-deceived, and not conscious of any fraud. (5) In 1864, Strauss restated his theory, and showed evidence that he had come greatly under the influence of Baur. While before he had acquitted the disciples of any intentional fraud, he now claims that they did not scruple to resort to pious fraud to accomplish their purposes.

We urge the following objections to the theory of Strauss: (1) The natural and the supernatural are so blended in the narratives that they must both stand or fall together. I might give a number of illustrations just here, but all readers of the New Testament can readily see that there is no possible way of separating the natural and supernatural in the New Testament. Strauss seems to have realized this difficulty, and strives to strike out of the new Testament passages that bear the strongest evidence of being historical. (2) The genuineness of the canonical gospels, which the severist criticism has not been able to invalidate, is a decisive argument against the mythical theory of Strauss. The German skeptic claims that these narratives were written the last half of the second century; but the critics of the world have definitely decided that they were written more than a hundred years before this time. Strauss criticised these narratives with the most profane levity, but his work was a failure. Even Renan says: "The composition of the Gospels was one of the most important events to the

future of Christianity, which occurred during the second half of the first century." In referring to these narratives in another place he says: "All, in my judgment, date back to the first century, and they are substantially by the authors to whom they are attributed." (3) The theory of Strauss fails to account for the belief of the apostles in the divinity of Christ. He says that there was a fixed idea that the Messiah would work miracles, and that there was a fixed persuasion among the disciples that Jesus was the Messiah. But what caused this fixed persuasion on the part of the disciples that Jesus was the Christ? They were very slow in belief, and were only convinced by the most astounding miracles. Their persuasion never did become fixed until after the resurrection, and Thomas required the very strongest evidence of the senses. Even the enemies of Jesus in the early history of Christianity did not deny his miracles. (4) The theory of Strauss that the writers of the New Testament were self-deceived, and not guilty of any fraud, bears upon its face the most reckless absurdity. If they wrote falsehoods, they knew it, and their lives were entirely inconsistent with such a theory. If these narratives had contained myths, the early enemies of Christianity would have pointed them out. (5) The re-statement of his theory by Strauss in 1864 was largely a retraction. While before this he exonerated the disciples from intentional deception, he now claims that they did not hesitate to deceive in order to carry out their purposes. The moral character of the disciples is a sufficient answer to the baseless charge of the German skeptic to save his own false theory. (6) The mythical theory is disproved from the fact that there was no body of disciples to whom the origination of myths can be attributed. The disciples formed one body at the time Strauss claims that the myths originated, and there was not time enough between the death of Christ and the written narratives of miracles for the formation of myths. (7) The mythical theory is not consistent with the times in which Christianity originated. Myths appear in the infancy of a nation; but Christianity took its origin in the age of such historians as Tacitus and Josephus. (8) The mythical theory

cannot account for the faith of the apostles in the resurrection of Christ. (9) The sophistical character of the criticism applied by Strauss to the contents of the New Testament bears heavily against his theory. The forced likeness between the miracles of the Old and New Testaments is entirely unworthy of a true critic. (10) The mythical theory is founded upon a false system of philosophy. Its author belonged to the left wing of the Hegelian philosophy, which adopted methods of interpretation exactly the opposite of the true historic method.

CHAPTER XVII

CHRISTOLOGY, THE ULTIMATE PHILOSOPHY

All the great problems with which philosophy has concerned itself are solved by Christology as nowhere else. Christology is the Ultimate Philosophy. President W. D. Hyde, of Bowdoin College, in 1903, asked a class of sixty students, most of them seniors, to write out their individual creeds. After comparison and proper discussion they unanimously adopted the following: "I believe in one God, present in nature as law, in science as truth, in art as beauty, in history as justice, in society as sympathy, in conscience as duty, and supremely in Christ as our highest ideal.

"I believe in the Bible as the expression of God's will through man; in prayer as the devotion of man's will to God; and in the church as the fellowship of those who try to do God's will in the world.

"I believe in worship as the highest inspiration to work; in sacrifice as the price we must pay to make right what is wrong; in salvation as growth out of selfishness into service; in eternal life as the survival of what loves and is lovable in each individual; and in judgment as the obvious fact that the condition of the gentle, the generous, the modest, the pure, and the true is always and everywhere preferable to that of the cruel, the sensual, the mean, the proud, and the false." Christology contains every principle named in this creed. It comprehends all our highest ideals of God, of man and his duty; of God's revelation to man; and of man's destiny beyond the confines of the visible universe.

SECTION ONE

Christ's Interpretation of God

There is no other philosophy which can so comprehensively interpret God, as can a true Christian Philosophy.

It recognizes the truth contained in all previous systems, and not only adds to it but gives it a vitality never known before.

The Divine Personality

Christianity is in great contrast to Buddhism on the question of Divine Personality. With the Buddhist personality is an evil, and they strive to eliminate it; with Christians it is the greatest blessing, and they develop it to the highest extent. Christ came to give life and to give it abundantly. With the Christ the Divine Personality was the central thought in the universe, and he presented the highest Theism that the world has ever known. Dr. Francis C. Patton, in an address before the American Institute of Christian Philosophy, used the following language: "A consistent use of words would require us to look for some common attribute as a bond of union between the various theisms of the world, polytheism, pantheism, heathenism, monotheism, and to confine the application of the word atheism to those forms of belief which lack this attribute. It would then be found, perhaps, that Animism and Materialism represent the two poles of religious opinion: that atheism is always materialistic, and that theism proceeds under animistic conceptions, imputing change to agency of which the human will is the type, and even in the extreme case of pantheism, being always in a measure anthropomorphic. Usage, however, has not been determined by the demands of strict logic. Theism is now confined to a narrower meaning. It is generally understood to be synonymous with monotheism, and, as it would be an obvious mistake to call a polytheist an atheist, the denial of theism is indicated by anti-theism. In fact, the term atheism, which has always been one of uncertain application, seems to be rapidly going into disuse. But while theism is employed in the restricted sense just named, the word 'God' is still used with greater latitude of meaning; so writers are quite ready to say that the idea of God is innate, who would hesitate to say that men are theists by intuition. There is good reason for this distinction it

must be confessed; for while the discussion of monotheism may involve an inquiry into the genesis of religious feeling, and while, moreover, it may be proper to make the explanation of the religious feeling the basis of classification when considering the various accounts of monotheism, the two questions are nevertheless distinct, and an answer to the one does not necessarily settle the other."

Christology not only harmonizes with, but it really suggests all the arguments that have been used to prove the existence of one true God. These arguments may be comprehended under the following heads: evolution, reason, intuition, and revelation. I can see no good reason why one of these arguments should necessarily exclude the others. Whatever may be said in reference to previous revelations of the Divine Personality, they are certainly not complete without Christology.

The following from the learned Dr. A. M. Fairbairn in his very interesting work on "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology," will be read with great profit by our readers: "The interpretation of God consists of two distinct yet complementary parts—a doctrine of God and of the Godhead. God is deity conceived in relation, over against the universe, its cause or ground, its law and end; but the Godhead is deity conceived according to His own nature, as He is from within and for Himself. God is the Godhead in action within the sphere of the related and the conditioned; the Godhead of God in the region of transcendental existence, yet with his immanent activities so exercised that His absolute being is concrete and complex, as opposed to abstract and simple. God is an object of natural knowledge—*i. e.*, He can be known from His works, or by a process of regressive or analytical thought; but the Godhead is a subject of supernatural revelation—*i. e.*, can be known only as man is in a sense taken into the secrets of the Divine nature. By the light of reason, we may know that God is, but what He is we can know only as He, Himself, speaks. Yet the natural knowledge is incomplete without the supernatural. What reason reaches is an abstraction, or a sense of co-ordinated qualities, streams whose course is beneficent, tendencies that make for righteousness; but what revelation discloses is the life

within—the motives, the emotions, the inner nature of Him who speaks; in a word, it changes our idea of God into knowledge of the Godhead. But this means that man no longer looks at God through the eyes of nature, but rather at nature through the eyes of God—*i. e.*, he thinks of the Divine in the categories of the Divine, or through a consciousness of its creation. And this constitutes the distinction between natural and revealed religion: the former is God read through nature, or interpreted in its terms; the latter is nature read through God, or interpreted in the terms of a consciousness pervaded by His word. The characteristics of a theology reasoned out from the principles of a revealed religion may, then, be said to be this—the inner qualities and constitution of the Godhead are made so to penetrate the notion of God that all His outer action is conceived as a transcript of His inner being. The logical consequence of the revealed doctrine of the Godhead is thus a new doctrine of God.”

The Transcendence of God

There are two systems of philosophy around which nearly all the great thinkers for the past hundred years have arranged themselves. These systems are the theories of Omniscience and of Nescience. Germany has been the soil upon which the theory of Omniscience has had its greatest growth. The Germans place it at the head of the sciences, and look upon it as the final philosophy. England has been the soil best adapted to the theory of Nescience. We will more fully discuss this theory later. Both schools have been well represented in France. Cousin is the most noted name connected with the Absolute Philosophy, and Comte is the most noted man of the positive school.

We now call more special attention to the Absolute Philosophy. In Germany the Absolute Philosophy became in the hands of one party a kind of pantheistic infidelity; while in the hands of another it claimed to be in perfect harmony with Christianity. Strauss represented what is sometimes called the left wing of this philosophy, while Marheineke and others represented the right wing. The left wing was infidel, while the right wing was considered

quite orthodox. It is evident to all judicial thinkers that the Absolute Philosophy contained much truth, and its great leaders were always able to present unanswerable arguments to materialists and atheists. Its history is of great value to the religious thinker. Still it was an extreme and in the very nature of things could never become the final philosophy.

Christology fully recognizes all the truth contained in the Absolute Philosophy. It recognizes man's ability to know God, whom to know aright is life eternal. While it places proper limitations upon the human intellect, it does not fail to note the historic fact that man has always worshipped higher beings under the sense of need. In a very important sense man has always been a God intoxicating being, and with all his limitations, religion has been the most absorbing theme of his history. Jesus never made the mistake of the great Confucius in identifying God with the heavens. He always recognized a positive difference, and constantly spoke of the Father in heaven. There is nothing more plainly taught in the New Testament than the fact that God transcends nature. The Bible teaches that the heavens declare the glory of God, but it clearly distinguishes him from the heavens. As we will soon see this transcendence of God is in perfect harmony with his immanence in nature. Light is in the rainbow, but it is at the same time above it; so God is in nature, but at the same time transcends it.

The Immanence of God

The advocates of the theory of Nescience consider it the Ultimate Philosophy. They think that the Theological and Philosophical ages have passed forever, and that Evolution has now reached the Positive stage. John Stuart Mill is the greatest representative of the Positive Philosophy to be found on English soil. In many respects he is a great improvement on August Comte. His writings are not so materialistic and atheistic in their character as are those of the noted Frenchman. Herbert Spencer pushes to its ultimate results the Nescience taught by Hamilton and Mansel. It must be admitted that great theologians

have advocated the theory of Nescience, and have waged destructive war upon all the disciples of Transcendentalism. As the scientific and philosophic world has espoused the one side or the other, the same thing can be largely said of theologians. This makes it evident that both extremes contain much truth, and it is important to find a mediator. In all the great universities of the world, the faculties in science, philosophy, and theology prosper as they never have before. There never was a time when more interest was taken in theology than at the present time. Even many advocates of the Positive Philosophy are now giving their attention to Theology.

Christology teaches the truths contained in both the theories of Omniscience and Nescience. It clearly teaches the transcendence of God, and, at the same time the immanence of God. As light can be in the rainbow as well as above it, so God can be in nature as well as above it.

The great scientist Le Conte says: "What, then, is the alternative view? It is the utter rejection with Berkeley and Swedenborg of the independent existence of matter and the real efficient agency of natural forces. It is a frank return to the old idea of divine agency, but in a new, more rational, less anthropomorphic form. It is the bringing together and complete reconciliation of the two apparently antagonistic and mutually excluding views of divine agency and *natural law*. Such reconciliation we have already seen is the true test of a rational philosophy. It is the belief in a God not far away beyond our reach, who once long ago enacted laws and created forces which continue of themselves to run the machine called nature, but a God *immanent*, a God resident *in Nature*, at all times and in all places directing every event and determining every phenomena—a God in whom in the most literal sense not only we but all things have their being, in whom all things consist, through whom all things exist, and without whom there would be and could be nothing. According to this view the phenomena of Nature are naught else than objectified modes of divine thought, the forces of nature naught else of regular modes of operation of that divine will, invariably because He is unchangeable. According to this view the law of gravitation is naught else

than the mode of operation of the divine energy in sustaining the cosmos—the divine method of sustentation; the law of evolution naught else than the mode of operation of the same divine energy in originating and developing the cosmos—the divine method of creation; and Science is the systematic knowledge of these divine thoughts and ways—a rational system of natural theology. In a word, according to this view, there is no real efficient force but spirit, and no real *independent* existence but God.”

God as a Father

Jesus taught the Fatherhood of God as it had never been taught before. It is true that the prophets had regarded Jehovah as the Father of his people, but the true doctrine of *divine fatherhood* had never been understood until the ministry of the Christ. Jesus spake as familiarly of his Father in heaven as man could speak of his earthly father. His knowledge of the divine nature appeared infinite compared with the limited nature of man's knowledge. His doctrine of the Fatherhood of God gave his disciples an enlarged conception of man's relationship to the Supreme Being, and placed upon him the very highest obligations to obedience. The counterpart of his doctrine of Divine Fatherhood was his doctrine of universal brotherhood. Man's conceptions of his relationship to God are not only changed; but his conceptions of his relationship to man are also changed. This doctrine could not otherwise than have a beneficial influence on the progress of civilization.

The Attributes of God

While man from the study of nature acquired much knowledge of the divine attributes, the study of Christology places them in a much higher light. Paul condemned the heathen world for not recognizing the lessons of nature in the instruction they give in reference to the eternal power and Godhead of the Supreme Ruler. He declared that they were without excuse even from the standpoint of natural theology; and, of course, their condemnation would be all the greater, in case they failed to see God in the mission of His Son.

In the history of religion, we find that man has frequently justified the most cruel conduct towards others on account of his misconceptions of the attributes of God. Even Paul thought that he was doing God's service when he was committing the most criminal acts towards the disciples of Christ. The disciples of Mohammed thought that they builded their system of religion on the moral attributes of God, and there never lived more ruthless invaders than were the followers of the Arabian prophet. Those who would not submit to what they thought to be the will of God had to pay tribute or be put to the sword. In many cases they had to accept at once the religion of Islam, or be put to the sword.

The Essence of God

Christians have persecuted both Jews and Christians, but they did not understand the teaching of the New Testament. Their religion was that of the law, and not that of the Gospel. When religion is builded upon what is supposed to be the divine justice, it is very apt to be a persecuting religion. It is not difficult for fanatics to reach the conclusion that God's justice requires vengeance towards all those who refuse to obey him.

Jesus not only presented the moral attributes of God in the very highest spiritual light, but he revealed the very essence of God. God is spirit, God is light, and God is love. No ancient philosophy or theology had ever presented to mankind such a trinity as this. When man reaches this high conception, he is lifted out of his selfishness, and is anxious to do his duty to both God and man. Christology should be carefully taught in all our higher institutions of learning, for it is the true antidote for the materialism of this day. It is useless to talk about sectarianism in a philosophy and theology, which give such a perfect exposition of the divine nature. Whatever may be a man's religion he is certainly not going to be injured by being taught that God is light, God is spirit, and God is love. Christology is certainly the Ultimate philosophy.

SECTION TWO

The Universe Created by the Logos

Thought is back of the forces of nature. The greatest scientific thinkers in the world affirm this fact. In 1903, after a lecture in London by Prof. Henslow on "Present Day Rationalism," Lord Kelvin, Great Britain's foremost man of science, gave utterance to thoughts that attracted the attention of the scientific and religious world. The London correspondent of the New York Tribune thus describes what occurred: "Professor Henslow had stated that modern science neither affirms nor denies creative power in the origin of life. Lord Kelvin replied that science positively affirms creative power and makes every one feel a miracle in himself. It was not in dead matter, he added, that men lived, moved, and had their being, but in a creative and directive power, which science compelled them to accept as an article of belief. Modern biologists were coming once more to the acceptance of something, and that was a vital principle. Agnostics they might be in science, but they only knew the Creator in his works and were absolutely forced by science to admit and to believe with absolute confidence in a directive power. Lord Kelvin made a rigid application of the logical law of excluded middle and contended that there must either be scientific belief in creative power or the acceptance of the Ciceronian theory of a fortuitous concourse of atoms. Because biologists could not escape from the conclusion that there was original creative power when they studied the physics and dynamics of living and dead matter, science was not antagonistic to religion, but a help to it."

Lord Kelvin still further said, "Forty years ago I asked Liebig, walking somewhere in the country, if he believed that the grass and flowers we saw around us grew by mere chemical force. He answered: 'No, no more than I could believe that a book of botany describing them could grow by mere chemical forces.' Every action of a human free will is a miracle to physical and chemical and mathematical science,"

The above statement of Lord Kelvin, probably the greatest scientist in the world at the beginning of the twentieth century, will do much to counteract the materialistic tendency of many leading scientists, even in the twentieth century. The great trouble with many scientists is the fact that they are largely ignorant of the great religious facts of our age, and consequently reach universal conclusions from particular premises. A philosopher, like Lord Kelvin, can be just towards both science and religion.

The London Spectator declares that the position of Lord Kelvin is impregnable to the unprejudiced mind. The same journal still further says: "The attempt to trip up the great scientist over the use of the time-honored phrase 'a fortuitous concourse of atoms' with respect to the formation crystals was a mere attempt to confuse the issue in the minds of the public. Again, Lord Kelvin in assenting that 'modern biologists are coming once more to the firm acceptance of something, and that was a vital principle, never suggested the exploded doctrine that declared that the operation of life is controlled by special laws other than the laws of the inorganic world. To conceive of the existence of a vital principle need in no sense infringe the law of the conservation of energy if such principle is not introduced from without. It is the mechanical conception of God that some scientists are disposed to import into religion which creates the difficulty. Of course if a scientist premises that the God of the universe as conceived by religion is a God who 'sitteth above the water flood' in a physical sense, who, in fact, exists outside of, and entirely apart from, the physical universe, then one may feel sorry for the scientist, but not, perhaps, surprised at conclusions logically evolved from his own limited and erroneous rendering of religious and philosophical ideas. He has still to learn that revelation asserts the kingdom of God to be within the universe, and to be neither external nor intermittent in its operations."

Through the Logos God Created the Physical Universe

The first chapter of John is the most sublime philosophy in the world; and the first verse is the most sublime verse

in the Bible. It deserves to be written in letters of gold. The fundamental element from which all things have come has been one of the great problems with philosophy from Thales to the present time. No one could speak with such definite knowledge of the beginning as did John the apostle. Where Moses makes the point of his departure, John begins, and goes back. The object of Moses was to develop Judaism; the object of John was to give the origin of the scheme of redemption, and he, of course, had to have a higher point of departure than had Moses.

In the beginning the Word was with God, and the Word was God. How could the Word, or Logos, be with God, and be God at the same time? It must have been with God in one sense, and have been God in another sense. It was with God in the sense of separate personality, and at the same time it was God in nature. That is, the Logos was of the same nature as God. We can only conceive of three natures; the nature of God, the nature of angels, and the nature of man. The Logos took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham. The Word, then, was not of the nature of man, or the nature of angels, but of the nature of God. The word may appear a little awkward applied to God, but it is probably the best word we can get. Paul declared that the pagan gods were by nature no gods, which implies that our God is God by nature.

As the word of man represents man, so the Logos, or Word of God, represents God. Through the Logos or Word, God created the heavens and earth. Modern materialism can present no account of creation so beautiful and unique. Aristotle and the ancient Gnostics believed in the eternity of matter; but John presents a better philosophy, and shows that all material things were created by the Logos.

God Created Life Through the Logos

The Logos was life in the absolute sense, and could communicate itself. By it all life was created. This gives us a rational explanation of the origin of life; for life could not have come from the lifeless. This life, which was the originator of all life, is the true light of men. The

life that is the light of men is spiritual life, and it develops the same element in man into true light. The man who is destitute of divine life is also destitute of divine light. The Logos, the true Light of the World, came to a wicked and ignorant people, who failed to apprehend the divine Light. It is certainly true that God created the universe through the Logos.

God Created Man Through the Logos

All creation was a preparation for man. Evolution would be meaningless, if, indeed, it did not result in the production of an intelligent being, who was intended to be lord of this world. Without man, so far as we know, the whole universe would be a failure. In December, 1901, Professor Logan Lobley, F. R. G. S., read a paper before the Victoria Institute, London, on "The Preparation of the Earth for Man's Abode." After the paper, Dr. Edward Hull, F. R. S., Secretary of the Institute, made the following remarks: "Mr. Chairman,—At my suggestion Professor Logan Lobley kindly undertook to deal with the subject of his essay. It is one which, as it seems to me, is eminently suited for the consideration of members of the Institute, and I feel assured that it will be allowed that it has been ably handled by the author.

"It is one of the great triumphs of science of the nineteenth century, and of the Victorian Era, that it has witnessed the unfolding of the Geological Record. For nearly eighteen centuries of the Christian Era, not to speak of the many previous centuries, mankind had no other guide to his knowledge of what we may designate 'the pre-Adamic history of the world and its inhabitants' beyond that afforded by early chapters of the Book of Genesis. I am not here to disparage the geological record contained in that wonderful book, which I never read, or hear read, without recognizing that it is far beyond what unassisted human reason could have imagined or produced at the time it was written. It contains in simple and state-ly language the main outline of the history of the world and of its inhabitants; but it was left for recent scientific investigation to fill in the details, and to complete the

record. That has been the great work of the nineteenth century; and the author has unfolded it to us this evening, briefly as was necessary, but with sufficient fulness to enable us to recognize the grand procession of vital phenomena—the development of animal and plant life, of which the earth has been the theatre—from the earliest dawn to the present period.

“The portion of the essay which will cause most interest is probably that in which we approach the appearance of the animals and plants now inhabiting the globe, and which ranges through the Tertiary period. There we have the process of organic evolution by which the forms more and more approximating to those now inhabiting the world appeared in company with man himself. It was a slow and gradual process, as are all the great events of Providence in the affairs of the world, in His plan for the government of the world, there must always be ‘the fulness of time’; and in the natural world we know that it is governed according to the proverb ‘*Natura nil facit persaltem.*’ Thus when the time arrived those forms of animal life appeared which were destined to minister to man’s physical wants as well as to his advance in civilization. Along with them came the forms of plant life, specially adapted for sustenance, as well as to adorn and beautify the face of nature, and to minister to his mental enjoyment. At last man himself appeared on the scene—the last and most perfect of all God’s works, equipped with powers and faculties suited to enjoy the great gifts placed within his reach, and with mental powers capable of investigating the laws which govern the universe. For him the whole world is a Garden of Eden; for him, every habitable portion is furnished with animals and plants suited to minister to his wants. Surely, in all this we may see clear and unmistakable evidence of design and adaptation, illustrating the striking passage of the Psalmist, ‘The heaven, even the heaven is the Lord’s, but the earth He has given to the children of men,’ given as his school for training in the knowledge of God and of His works, and of His purposes of love, in preparing us for a still higher state of bliss.”

God made man in His own image. We can now see the purpose of creation. Man was to be a free moral agent

like unto His God. His mission is to so use this world and the present life as to prepare himself for a higher world and a higher life. The word man is used in a generic sense and includes woman. Woman is the counterpart of man; and, in many respects, the most important in the progress of civilization. God's work has only been completed by the Incarnation. Adam was only a figure of *him* who was to come.

SECTION THREE

Christ the True Interpreter of Man

It was through the Logos that man was made in the divine image, and the Christ is consequently the true interpreter of man.

Everything preceding man appears to have been a prophecy of his appearing upon the earth. That he has a close relationship to the animal below him, no one will for a moment question. That he also has in his nature elements relating to the world above him, the Christ especially teaches. He occupies the hiatus that would have otherwise been unoccupied between the natural and spiritual worlds. His nature seems to be made up of the grossness of the one and the refinement of the other.

[Some philosophers, looking only at the material side of man, have defined him simply as an intelligence assisted by organs. They fail to discriminate between man and the brute, for the lower animals are intelligent and are assisted by organs. In his bodily organization man is, of course, an animal, and he is the perfection of animal progress. The student of geology is necessarily convinced that man stands at the head of animal creation. Any true definition of man must include his relationship to the lower animal, but it must not stop there. While man is an animal he is much more than an animal. He is an organized, intelligent being, endowed with the powers of abstraction and conscience.

Through the Logos, man was made in the image of God in intellect. He has ability to fully recognize his own personality, and to know definitely his identity. He

begins with certainty, and his own nature contradicts any theory of absolute agnosticism. The Agnostic might be asked how he knows that he does not know, for when he makes any affirmation he contradicts his own theory. There are things that man can positively know, for God did not create the senses and reason to deceive him. Man can reason from cause to effect, which enables him to subdue nature, and advance civilization. We can even know something of things invisible, and through nature and revelation we are enabled to know God, whom to know aright is life eternal.

Through the Logos, man was made in the image of God in his sensibilities. Almost inseparably connected with the intellect is feeling. Buddhists and Pantheists may conceive of what they call God without feeling, but nature and revelation teach us nothing about such a God. The God of nature and revelation is a God of feeling, and man was made in his image. Every effect must have an adequate cause, and the sensibilities of man cannot be accounted for upon any other hypothesis than that the God who created man is a God of feeling. Man is in the image of God in knowledge, for in some things he is able to know as God knows; so in feeling he is in God's image, for he is able to feel some things as God feels. God loves man, and has given many manifestations of his love; so we are taught to love him, because he first loved us. So long as man retains capacity to love God, he has not entirely lost the image in which he was created.

Through the Logos, man was created in the image of God in his freedom of will. Dr. Carpenter makes free will power in man the distinguishing characteristic between him and the lower animals. Man is conscious of having a personal free will, which can act as a cause. In freedom and causative power man is, then, in the image of God. Man is, therefore, held responsible for his conduct. Society never attributes right and wrong to a beast, but man is the subject of moral obligation. See the author's *Cultura*.

The Christ knew what was in man, and was able to sympathize with him in all his infirmities. He was tempted in all points in which man could be tempted, yet he was without sin. Jesus frequently called himself the Son of

Man; in fact, if I am not mistaken it was his favorite expression.

Jesus presented humanity at its best, and without the Incarnation it would be very difficult to correctly interpret human nature. No other philosophy so correctly explains man's freedom and high spiritual susceptibilities as does Christology.

The Christ presented man a standard of life calculated to lift him to the very highest intellectual and spiritual plane of which humanity was susceptible. Jesus was entirely sinless. While he convicted others of sin, no one could convict him of sin. Jesus was perfectly developed. When humanity reaches his standard, its culture will certainly reach perfection. The spirit of Jesus was catholic, and not sectarian like that of nearly all other great religious leaders. In fact, Christianity is in reality the only universal religion in the world.

SECTION FOUR

God's Revelation Through the Logos

Revelation in its widest significance is any species of knowledge of which God is its ultimate source. It includes all that belongs to ethics and natural religion. In the early history of the church the comprehensive use of the term was more common than at the present time. The early defenders of Christianity had to vindicate it against polytheism. This naturally led them to defend the unity of God, and the principles of natural religion in general. When, however, polytheism ceased to be a foe, and deism took its place, there was of necessity a change in the method of defence. The deist admitted the claims of natural religion and opposed himself to Christianity. The work of the apologist was, then, to show the necessity of a revealed religion.

A failure to distinguish between revelation and inspiration has led to much confusion. Revelation discloses new truth that is inaccessible to the human mind; inspiration is more of the nature of superintendence. A man to whom a revelation is given is also inspired to express it; yet a man

may be inspired and not reveal anything new. A large portion of the Bible is of the first kind. Jonathan Edwards makes the following distinction: "We ought to make a distinction between those things which were written in the sacred Scriptures by the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and those things which were committed to writing by the direction of the Holy Spirit."

God's highest revelation was through his Son. Moses predicted a prophet greater than himself, who would complete divine revelation. Of all God's prophets in the Old Testament, none were to be compared to Moses. The antitype of Moses in the New Testament fulfilled the Old Covenant and established a new one upon higher principles. He was in constant communion with his Father in Heaven, and predicted his own death and resurrection. He was a prophet in a higher sense than Moses in the fact that he not only possessed the Holy Spirit himself, but bestowed it upon the apostles and made them prophets. God revealed himself to us in Christ. John says: "No man has seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (John I: 18 R. V., marg.). The Son reveals the Father the visible Christ reveals the invisible God. We have in Christ a knowledge of God expressed in the terms of humanity. The very essence of God is revealed in Christ. God is light, God is Spirit, God is love. Life and immortality were fully brought to light in the mission of the Son of God. The future life had never been made so real to man as Jesus made it. He made the future world even more real than the present; and he impressed upon man the importance of living for eternity as well as for time. See the author's *Macrocosmus*.

SECTION FIVE

Christology the Ultimate Social Philosophy

Christian sociology is a very important science at the present time, for the tendency of Protestantism has been to an extreme individualism. Both the church and society have suffered from this extreme tendency. Individuals

have been leeches, which have fattened themselves on society. Christian sociology is greatly needed to counteract this extreme. There is also another extreme that is equally dangerous. It is not so much socialism as it is infidel socialism, that has done so much harm during the past fifty years. This extreme view practically denies all individual liberty, and the individual is scarcely considered as having any intrinsic value in himself. He is only regarded as a means to an end—an instrument to advance the interest of society. While extreme individualism makes society valuable only as a boat carrying the passenger, extreme socialism makes society a sea, and individuals only as waves that rise and fall. Christian sociology condemns these metaphors; and it makes society a body, and individuals members of this body. The members are as necessary to the perfection of the body as the body is necessary to the health and welfare of the members. Both Christ and Paul taught that there could be no body without members and no members without the body.

Christian sociology especially concerns itself with three normal forms of society, viz: the family, the state and the church. The state is a development out of the family, and, in a sense the church is a development out of the state. Christ did not destroy the law and the prophets, but he did fulfill them. He re-enacted every commandment of the Decalogue except one, and he placed them all upon a much higher plane. In the place of the Jewish Sabbath, he established the Lord's Day; but even the Jewish Sabbath itself he fulfilled. "There is a rest remaining for the people of God." While, in a sense, Christianity was a development, "first the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear," still the church was quite original with Jesus. It was to be built upon a divine foundation, and be animated by the spirit of the new commandment which he himself had given.

Christ and the Family

Jesus gives special attention to the family as one of the normal forms of society. He teaches the importance of a higher morality and spirituality on the subject than had

ever been known before. The overthrow of the ancient family institutions among the Romans was rapidly undermining Roman civilization. The Jews were not so bad, but their loose ideas concerning divorce were rapidly rendering void the ethical influence of Judaism. The liberal school of Hillel had become a very great offender on this question, and a man could even obtain a divorce in case he found another woman he liked better than his wife. Well could Jesus charge upon the Jewish teachers that they had made void the word of God by their traditions. He referred them back to the primal law of marriage, when God made one woman for one man, and declared that the twain should be one flesh. Not even father or mother had the right to stand in the way of a proper marital union. If necessary, man was to give up even father and mother, and cleave to his wife. In opposition to the traditional view of divorce, he would allow divorce on no other ground than adultery, which crime in itself severed the marriage bond. Jesus was very specific in his teachings in reference to the family, and the principal cause of this doubtless was the fact that the family stands at the foundation of all true civilization. It is really a social microcosm, and its purity and perpetuity are essential to the progress of civilization. Without the Christian family, we would certainly be without the Christian state and the Christian church.

On its physical side, Jesus regarded marriage, like other physical social elements, as belonging simply to the present age. The much married woman of the Sadducees' puzzle is upon this principle easily solved. The levirate law will not apply to the future world, where all are as the angels of God. As the physical and transient in the kingdom of God will ultimately give way to the spiritual and permanent so in the family, the spiritual union which must have accompanied the physical, will alone survive, and the love and union of husband and wife will be transmuted into the love and union of children of a common Father. They will be united in the great spiritual family of the redeemed.

The theology of Jesus is largely based upon the family. The Father in heaven was the most endearing name to the Christ, and he taught all his disciples to direct their

prayers to the heavenly Father. All his disciples were regarded as one family, of which he was the elder brother. He prayed that they might be one, as he and the Father were one; he wanted no rupture in the divine family. The New Testament conception is the one family in both heaven and earth.

The educational possibilities of the family are certainly very great. There can be no substitute for the educational influence of father and mother. The Bible requires parents to educate their children. In Shakespeare there are no children mentioned, and I believe there is only one mother named, but in the Bible it is entirely different. God's book largely dwells upon the duties of the family. The Old Covenant was very specific on the educational duties of parents. The New Testament also requires parents to teach their children. Professor Seeley claims that much harm has been done by parents entrusting to others that part of the child's education which they should perform themselves. There are many things that parents can teach their children that cannot so well be taught by others. There is a great necessity of a revival of family teaching in all parts of Christendom.

The family has a very important mission to society. Its failure in many cases to perform this mission, has caused the infidel part of the socialists to make special attacks on the family. When families become selfish and ignore the plain duties they owe to society, they undermine the very foundations of the family itself. Jesus Christ taught exactly the opposite to a selfish family. With him, the family was an institution that should minister to the welfare of society.

There can be no question that the solution of some of our most difficult social problems largely depends upon the family. The learned Dr. Hodge, in his "Outlines of Theology," uses these weighty words: "As the social organization is founded on the distinction of sexes, and as the well-being of the state and the purity and prosperity of the church rest on the sanctity of the family relation, it is of the last importance that the normal or divinely constituted relation of the sexes be preserved in its integrity." In Volume II of Kent's Commentaries, we have the following: "The

primary and most important of domestic relations is that of husband and wife. It has its foundation in nature, and is the only lawful relation by which Providence has continued the human race. In every age it has had a propitious influence on the moral influence and happiness of mankind. It is one of the chief foundations of social order. We may justly place to the credit of the institution of marriage a great share of the blessings which flow from refinement of manners, the education of children, the sense of justice, and the cultivation of the liberal arts." If those reckless infidel socialists, who are making such an unceasing war upon the family, could be induced to study the language of the great law chancellor, there might be some possibility of their enlightenment. They certainly need disseminated among them a little more intelligence. They also need, even more than this, that development of conscience, which the Christianity of the Bible alone can do for them.

CHRIST AND THE STATE

Origin of the State

Aristotle claims that man is by nature a political animal. It is certain, then, that the state had its origin in the nature of man. As God has created the nature of man, he has, at least mediately created the state. The origin of the state was not by any social compact; but it grew out of man's needs. We were born into the state as we were born into the family. Aristotle taught that the man who was connected with no state was a monster, either above or below the level of human nature, and more likely to be below than above. This great philosopher contradicted the social contract theory of Epicurus long before its origination. He knows of no time when a contract was made between savages, and he has no knowledge of a people entirely destitute of political order. None but political theorists have any news from a savage country where a social compact was made.

The state is the institute of rights, which rights are implicit in our nature. There can be no harmonious development without them. They are properly stated in

the second table of the Mosaic law as follows: The right of life, of family, of property, and of good name. These are all essential to our highest ethical culture. Herbert Spencer says that a man has the right to live outside of all political society. Be that as it may, it is certain that he could not thus develop his highest manhood.

It is very evident that the state grew out of the family, for every family is really the state in miniature. Parents have to legislate, judge and execute law. The children as dependents, are necessarily treated as subjects. Dr. Paley truly says: "The family contains the rudiments of an empire." As time advanced the children and grandchildren would gather around the tent of the patriarch; so the government of one family would become the government of many families, all owning allegiance to a common ancestor. Many critics now claim that the matriarchal form of government preceded the patriarchal. This may have been true with some wandering tribes; but it is certain that the patriarchal form was very early established. The patriarch would finally gather around him so many followers that he would be able to conquer his neighbors, and thus the kingdom developed from the tribe and the empire from the kingdom. When we consider the authority of the patriarch, it is not difficult to understand why the ancient kingdoms were largely absolute monarchies.

The Progress of the State

It is interesting to trace, in Maine's "Village Communities," the gradual differentiation of the state from the family. In fact, for a long time the state was only the family extended, and the communism of the family was transferred to the state. The tribe forms the intermediate link between the family and the state. While the tribe is certainly not to be the permanent organization of mankind, it is a fact that it yet embraces the majority of the race. As Maine truly declares, the majority of mankind have stereotyped their institutions; and only the minority have succeeded in differentiating the state from the family. These have largely been Christian nations.

We learn from Tacitus that our Teutonic ancestors had

their village communities. These communities are found in Hindoostan and Russia, with but little change, even to the present day. Even in Russia, each group of habitations is ruled by a *pater familias*. The pasture land is owned in common; while the arable land is divided into lots, and cultivated according to the minute regulations of the community. The Russian Government does not interfere with the regulation of these communities. It is really the successor of the Mongolian khans, and the Mongolian Government was not a legislative despotism, but a tax-taking despotism. It is safe to state that among the Aryans we find at least the germ of the town meetings of New England.

John Stuart Mill makes the Jews an exception to the stationary tendency of other Asiatic nations. The following is his language: "The Jews, instead of being stationary, like other Asiatics, were, next to the Greeks, the most progressive of antiquity, and, jointly, with them have been the starting point and main propelling agency of modern civilization." He claims that the conditions of progress were favorable on account of the prophetic order. In this he is only partially correct; for the national progress of the Hebrews ante-dated the rise of the prophetic order to general influence. The founders of our nation were diligent students of the Bible, and it is not surprising that Dr. Franklin should find many striking points of resemblance between the Jewish nation and the American commonwealth. The American nation certainly has a bright future before it, if it continues to be governed by the true principles of Christianity.

The Divine Mission of the State

The state is not intended simply for princes and classes, but it is for the whole people. It has a divine mission. Bentham expresses it thus: "The greatest good of the greatest number." Jefferson improved on this in the following language: "All men have the inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Justice is the right of all; and any state which fails to recognize this higher law, is behind in the progress of civilization.

To secure justice among men, governments were instituted; and to secure this as far as possible, is the tendency of modern thought.

We have now reached that stage of progress in which all authority emanates from the people, and if all do not get justice, it is because of a lingering prejudice and superstition among the people. The remedy for these evils is largely in the hands of the people. The remedy for the evils of society is largely in the hands of the people, and they should select just and experienced representatives to make and administer the laws. Mr. Lecky, in his "History of England in the Eighteenth Century," fully recognizes this principle. These are his words: "One of the most difficult problems which the framers of constitutions are called upon to solve is that of providing that the direction of affairs shall be habitually in the hands of men of very exceptional ability, and at the same time preventing the instability, insecurity and alarm which perpetual and radical changes in the government must produce."

Civil society is an institution of God; for men were created to live together in a social civilized state. It seems to me that man's moral and social constitution make civil government a necessity, and that the civil state is really the natural state for man. All traditions connected with barbarism tend to show that it is largely a deterioration. The state, then, did not originate in a social compact and those writers are wrong who refer to this fiction as the ground of obedience to law. We were born in civil society, and subject to law. The mission of the state, therefore, is to see that we all have justice. All its regulations should be strictly in harmony with the principles of justice.

The powers of government are derived from the state. The supreme power is not in the government, but in the state. The fundamental law of the state is justice, and the authority of the state is limited by this fundamental law. It is certain, therefore, that the state has no rightful power to establish an unjust government, or to perform an unjust act. If civil government was better understood, it would greatly assist in the solution of some very important problems.

It is, of course, the duty of the state to protect the rights

of all, and this implies the authority to punish those who violate the law. Liberty and law are in perfect harmony; in fact, there can be no true liberty without law. Those persons are certainly wrong who suppose that true liberty is the absence of law. The law against theft does not abridge a man's liberty; for no one has a right to steal. The law against murder does not interfere with the liberty of man; for no man ever had the right to murder. The law, then, is essential to true liberty; for we could not enjoy our rights if the penalty of the law were not enforced against those who violate them. Man can claim freedom to do right, but he has no right to do wrong; and when he wilfully violates the law, his punishment is necessary to the general welfare. No punishment should be inflicted which is not for the general welfare. Severe punishment for minor offences tends to make the people look upon all crimes alike. In Texas and some other states they seem to esteem theft more than murder, and in some cases punish it more severely. The state should inflict any punishment that is necessary for its own defence and for the defence of its citizens. Says one, Has it the right to inflict capital punishment? I answer, it has, if capital punishment is essential to its own defense and that of the people. If the individual has a right to defend his life, liberty or property, by taking the life of his assailant, the state certainly has the right to do the same thing.

Our Duties to the State

The following duties are certainly incumbent upon every citizen of the state: (1) It is the duty of all to recognize the authority of the government under which they live. (2) Obedience to the laws of the state is incumbent upon every citizen. The Bible clearly teaches this. "Let every soul be subjected unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." (Rom. 13: 1-7.) When the civil law violates the law of God, then the civil law is, of course, to be rejected, for God's law is the highest in the universe, and any law that is out of harmony with it is without authority. "We ought to obey God rather than men."

(Acts. 5: 29.) (3) It is the duty of each citizen to help support his government. (4) Each citizen should be willing to do all he can to defend his country in the hour of danger. True patriotism will, at least, require this at his hands. (5) All officials should remember that civil government is something more than a machine, and that they should discharge their duties in the spirit and aims of uprightness and benevolence. The New Testament teaches that these duties should be performed with a loving and earnest spirit, "as to the Lord, and not unto men." What is, then, known as the "spoils system" is entirely out of harmony with a true Christian civilization. We should then in obedience to the Christ render unto the state that which belongs to it; and our duties to the state do not interfere with the still higher duties we owe to God.

Christ and the Church

It is certain that the church does not reach the masses as it should. The lower classes in our large cities, as a rule, have no sympathy with the church. They look upon it as a kind of clubhouse for the rich man, and do not consider themselves even privileged to attend. This is not as it was in the first century, for Christianity had a special message for the poor. Christ came to preach the gospel to the poor, and the apostles fully carried out his commission in that respect.

The church must have more of the spirit of Christ and bring itself again into sympathy with the people. In comparing the great cities of Christendom, it is a sad fact for our civilization that the great centers have very inadequate accommodations for the people. Berlin, the Athens of modern times, has only a few more than one hundred places of worship for more than two million of people. When we consider the inactivity of the German church, it is not surprising that there is so much infidel socialism in Germany. London has more than six millions of inhabitants, and only a few more than sixteen hundred churches to accommodate this vast multitude. If things continue this way there will be in another century many more than a submerged tenth.

It must be admitted that even in this country that there are very scant church accommodations in the great centers of influence. It is claimed that even the churches we have cannot be filled. It is certainly not because there are not people enough with which to fill them. It grows out of the hostility of the masses towards the church. The church is partly to blame for this, and much also grows out of social environment. Whatever the cause may be, it must be remedied, or our civilization is in danger.

The church cannot fulfill its mission unless it reaches the poor. There is a tendency in this country to move the churches from the centers in the city, where the poor live, to the suburban homes of the rich. This leaves the poor without church privileges. Some think the remedy for this is to build cheap chapels for the poor. This is not in harmony with the principles of Christianity, which make no distinction between rich and poor. All are one in Christ, and such distinctions only tend to alienate the people more and more from the church. Let suitable and convenient houses of worship be built for all classes to worship together. When a man becomes a Mohammedan, no difference how poor he is, all other Mohammedans receive him as a brother, and how much more so should this be with the followers of Christ!

There is a great responsibility resting upon the American church. Foreigners and their children constitute more than one-third of our inhabitants. As these foreigners usually go to cities, our cities soon become largely under foreign control. Fully eighty per cent of the population of the city of New York is either foreign born or the children of foreign born parents. In Chicago the per cent is even larger. What, then, can the American church do for these foreigners? It is certainly a fact that many of these foreigners have a special antagonism towards Christianity. It may be a Herculean task, but these people must be converted. Our forefathers were once savages, and Christianity subdued their ferocious nature and gave us modern civilization. It may be well for the state, in certain cases, to restrict emigration; but the mission of the church is to convert all. Christianity makes all men brothers, no difference what may be the race or nationality.

When the church has the spirit of its *founder*, it can do much towards the solution of our most important social problems. The study of the New Testament from the standpoint of sociology would be both profitable and interesting. In fact, I would like to see a good *socialistic commentary* on the whole Bible. The comparative study of the terms *ecclesia* and *koinonia* are of much sociological interest. No one can question the fact that the early Christian church furnished the world with the very highest type of society. It did not practise communism in the sense in which it is advocated by modern *infidel socialists*. Distribution was only made to those in need and those who would not work could not eat. There was no abolition of private property, for Peter said to Ananias, While it remained, it was your own. Ananias was condemned for trying to deceive the Holy Spirit in keeping back part of his property when he claimed to have given all. The apostle fully recognized the right of Ananias to it before he gave it away.

The liberality of the Jerusalem church is a model for all ages. In fact, Antioch and other churches showed a similar liberality. The early Christians would not lay up treasures on earth while their brethren were suffering for food. Nothing but a covetous and selfish exegesis can explain away the plain teaching of the New Testament on the subject. There is not a hint in the Acts of the Apostles that the liberality of the Jerusalem church was intended to be transitory. Similar circumstances would require equal liberality on the part of Christians even at the present time.

The church will never be able to fully command its resources until it returns to the unity and spirit of the apostolic church. If the church of the twentieth century had the liberality of the church of the first century, it could certainly do much towards settling the labor question. When Cromwell saw in a cathedral silver statues of the twelve apostles, he ordered them to be coined into money, so that they might go about doing good. A careful study of the New Testament from the standpoint of sociology would do much good. It might send out to do good the twelve or fifteen billions of dollars now hoarded up by

professed Christians. Those who are anxious for the church to fully accomplish its mission greatly deplore the divided condition of Christendom. Some Christian sociologists advocate co-operation on the part of all professed Christians; others favor organic union as it existed in the days of the apostles. Co-operation may prepare the way for something better; but all faithful students of the New Testament must work and pray for the unity that existed in the early church. When we have the unity for which Jesus prayed, then will the world soon be converted to the Christ. "Neither for these alone do I pray, but for them also that shall believe on me through their word; that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou didst send me." (John XVII 20-21). This unity can never be accomplished by force; for it would, then, be a despotism. This unity does not mean uniformity; it is to be one in Christ. Christ is the creed of the church; and all Christians should lay aside human creeds and unite upon the divine creed. Paul in the fourth chapter of Ephesians enumerate the items essential to this unity, and he makes it obligatory on Christians to strive to bring this about. This unity is certainly essential to the highest mission of the church.

Christ and Society

The social principles of Jesus are worthy of very careful study. He mingled with all classes of society, but lived above all; he judged all from the high spiritual principles of his kingdom. Jesus was not so much a reformer as the revealer of higher principles; he was not an agitator, but an idealist. Even reformers have often pronounced teachings as impracticable, but as civilization has advanced they have become more and more practical.

Thinkers have often been struck with the occasionalism of the teachings of Jesus. He was not the maker of a system, but considered each case by itself. Each individual was to him of immense value, on the principle that the shepherd leaves the ninety and nine sheep in order to seek the one that is lost. While the teachings of Jesus were

fragmentary, they contained principles that were to be the guiding stars of civilization. In both law and medicine the method of Jesus is adopted by many leading professors. In law it is illustrated by what is known as the case-system. Instead of lectures on fundamental principles, genuine cases are taken up and carefully scrutinized, and principles are deduced from these cases. The same thing can be said of medical teaching.

Jesus intended his social principles to apply to all mankind. He rose far above sect and party, and viewed all classes from the standpoint of the spiritual principles of his kingdom. His social principles were from above and not from beneath. He had a message for the rich, for the poor, and for the middle class.

He never hesitated to condemn in the severest terms the worshipper of mammon. It is certain that it is more the greed of the church than its creed that is making so many skeptics at the present time. The papers and magazines have recently had much to say about the high culture of Pope Leo XIII, and Pope Pius X; it is claimed that Leo had a marvelous influence on the civilization of the Nineteenth century, and it is predicted that Pius X will have fully as great an influence on the civilization of the twentieth century. All these writers fail to state that the Pope has five or six hundred attendants, and has an annual income of one and a half millions of dollars. What will sensible people think of his claims to be the successor of Simon Peter, who scarcely had a place to lay his head? There is hoarded up in Protestant hands more than ten billions of dollars, notwithstanding the fact that our Saviour warned his disciples against laying up treasures on earth. If all professed Christians would fully accept the teaching of the Christ, mammonism would rapidly disappear from this world.

Christology, which is really the Ultimate Social Philosophy, condemns the wrong wherever found. Human nature is much the same everywhere, and if laboring men could exchange places with capitalists, they would act very much as capitalists now act. This is shown by the way in which they treat one another. If a man does not happen to belong to their trust, they will not let him work;

and in this they not only violate the teachings of Christ, but also the principles of the American Constitution. It is an interference with personal liberty that should not at all be tolerated. I know a young man well who was thrown out of work because he could not conscientiously belong to a labor union. The union men would not work with him. This was certainly an unlawful interference with personal rights. The labor unions have doubtless done good in protecting the rights of the laboring men, and in this we rejoice, and will continue to rejoice. We cannot, however, sanction wrong on the part of any. The church should make a special effort to convert the laboring men, and protect them from the influence of infidel socialists. By a united effort on the part of all Christians, the church can do for the down trodden in the Twentieth century what it did for the same class in the first century.

Will there be a Social Millenium?

While I oppose every form of materialistic and atheistic evolution, I as fully believe in a true evolution as I believe in the laws of gravitation. Both science and the Bible point to the future for the golden age of civilization. Sociology as well as revelation teaches that there will be a millennium. The organized forces which will ultimately bring about this golden age in the history of humanity are the Family, the Church, and the State. In the history of the family, we find constant progress, although among some civilized nations there has been a constant tendency to deterioration. We sometimes become discouraged on account of the number of divorces in this country; but never in the history of the world has the family so great an influence in promoting genuine progress as at the present time. The Christian family will do much towards bringing about a Social millennium. The church is certainly the greatest ethical force in advancing a true civilization. So late as the period of Napoleon the First, the idea of universal empire was considered a legitimate national aspiration. The ethical force of Christianity has rendered that idea quite foreign to our civilization. Even skeptical writers admit that the moral force

of Christianity has abolished slavery. The spiritual enthusiasm of Christianity will finally bring about a social millennium. The Christian nation will do much towards developing the highest civilization. God designs the nation, as well as the family and the church, to bring about the perfection of humanity. The nation has its own special place and vocation in the evolution of society. As there is a divine order in the calling and founding of the family, there is also a divine order in the calling and founding of the nation. It has its foundation in the will of God, and its mission is one of righteousness. The Christian nation is, therefore, one of God's special agents in bringing about a social millennium. The center of history is the personal Christ, and this is the center towards which the nations move. The Christ of history will, then, ultimately bring about the millennium of science and the millennium of revelation.

CHAPTER XVIII

CHRISTOLOGY THE ULTIMATE THEOLOGY

Are the Ideals of the Christ Adapted to the Twentieth Century?

It is claimed by some that the ideals of the Christ are totally impractical. This is certainly a great mistake, for the ideals of the Christ have given us modern civilization.

Christ's Ideals of God

It must be admitted by all students of Christology that the Christ revealed to man the very nature of God. While Judaism was built upon the attributes of God, and the people were elevated by their worship; still they thought that the justice of God required them to hate other nations. The Pharisee, the most orthodox, could thank God that he was not like others. When the church has persecuted it has been inspired by the spirit of the ancient religions and not by the spirit of Christ. When Puritanism persecuted, it studied the Old Testament, and largely neglected the New. As soon as it gave more attention to the study of the New Testament, it quit persecuting. The Christ reveals the very essence of God, and thus gives the world a higher conception of his moral attributes.

The Christ revealed the highest conception of the personality of God. It is true that the Jewish religion taught the divine personality, but the Christ revealed it in the terms of humanity. I know that Lotze and Martineau have given very strong proofs from Natural Theology of the personality of God; but the Christ placed the divine personality in a higher light than ever known before. What a contrast between his teachings on this subject and that of Buddha. Buddha condemned personality as an evil, but the Christ made it the highest good. The

ideals of the Christ on this subject are certainly the ideals of the highest civilization of the twentieth century.

The Christ taught the spirituality of God as never taught before. Even the Jews and Samaritans had very limited ideas on the subject. The Samaritans believed that God was to be worshipped only in Samaria, and the Jews believed that he could only be truly worshipped in Jerusalem. But Jesus taught that God was not a local deity but could be worshipped anywhere just as well as in Samaria and Jerusalem. God is spirit and everywhere should be worshipped in spirit and truth. The spirituality of God should be taught everywhere in order to lift our age above its materialistic tendency.

Our Saviour taught the fact that God is light. This truth is essential to the progress of civilization. To get rid of intellectual and spiritual darkness it is necessary to walk in the light of God. Jesus well understood that nothing could enlighten the world of darkness except the light of God. He declared himself to be the light of the world, because he was making the light of God shine. He also instructed the disciples to let their light shine, that others might see their good works and glorify God. The purpose of light is to shine, so the purpose of Christianity is to enlighten the world. We cannot otherwise than rejoice at the missionary activity of the present age.

Jesus taught that God is love. Robert Browning says, "He that created love, shall he not love?" It is certainly evident that God has always loved man. But it is just as evident that until the coming of Christ mankind was largely governed by fear. The religions of the world were religions of fear. Even Judaism itself was no exception. It is the teachings of Jesus in reference to the divine love that has lifted the religious world into a higher and purer spiritual atmosphere. It is the character of God as love that especially adapts Christianity to this progressive age.

Jesus taught the fatherhood of God. Next to the existence of God we want to know our relationship to him. God appeared to the ancients as being too far away, and they made images in order to bring him closer to them. Jesus met this universal longing of the human heart in bringing God to man. He taught the paternity and provi-

dence of God. He did not teach that God was the father of the Jewish race, but the father of all nations. This view of the Father made all men brethren. In fact, the universal brotherhood of man is the counterpart of the fatherhood of God. It is not difficult to see how this doctrine would tend to unify the race and advance civilization. Divine providence as taught by Christ is in perfect harmony with the immanence of God in nature, and it may have suggested the modern scientific doctrine. The transcendence and immanence of God as taught by Christ are in harmony with the views of the most critical naturalists of the present age. The ideals of the Christ are interesting the scientists.

The Christ has revealed man to himself. He lived in an age of materialism and skepticism, but he knew what was in man. He found possibilities in human nature that had scarcely been known before. His anthropology should be studied carefully by every human being. It would be a blessing to even the highest educated people of the twentieth century.

Jesus taught the reality of the human soul. Philosophers have long disputed over the question of reality in both matter and mind, and they are far from reaching an agreement even at the present time. Jesus, by intuition at once announced the reality of the soul. He taught that it was the most real and most important thing in the world.

The Christ taught the spirituality of man. Modern psychology teaches that there are powers in the human mind that pertain to another world, for strictly speaking they transcend this. It is evident that man is something more than matter, and that spirit represents his higher nature better than any other word. He is a spiritual being, and as such, the body is only his servant. The spiritual nature of man needs special emphasis in the twentieth century.

Jesus taught man's duty as a free, moral agent. Philosophers had long discussed man's free agency, but Jesus paid no attention to this. He knew intuitively that man was responsible for his conduct, and he appealed directly to man's sense of responsibility. He insisted that man was the loser, even in case he gained the whole world, and then lost his own soul.

The Christ taught the accountability of man. As the son is responsible to the father for his conduct, so man is responsible to the Father in heaven for his conduct. He insisted that man would be required to give an account to God for his thoughts, words and deeds. This teaching is well adapted to the present age.

Jesus taught the immortality of the soul. The language of Dr. John Young, of Edinburgh, is here so appropriate that I will quote it: "Jesus Christ teaches that sin is perdition; not that it shall at some future day produce death; but that it is death. From first to last, throughout all its course, at every moment, moral evil is only death. Unless it be extirpated, the soul can only die; it may exist in a sense of simply being, but it is *really dying* rather than living; and forever its existence is a death, a process of perdition, whose final issue lies beyond an impenetrable veil. But life is the destiny of that nature which has been emancipated from moral evil. There is a holier and mightier vitality than that of the animal frame, or even than the physical life of the mind; that is, its power to think, feel and resolve. There is a life of life to man. God is the spring of pure being. Separated from him by ignorance or false views, by conscious guilt, distrust, and enmity, the soul carries in it the seeds of death, and in order to live, it must be restored to God, and God must be restored to it, to its knowledge, confidence, and love. It is this life of *God in man* which Christ's gospel teaches is eternal; which not only shall never be extinguished, but is essentially and necessarily immortal. On earth, in heaven, throughout the universe, *this is the eternal life*; the only eternal life known to Christianity—union or reunion of the created mind with God. It is this which shall survive uninjured the separation of soul and body. That separation shall not harm the nobler being, but the spiritual faculties shall be improved instead of being enfeebled by the crisis through which they have passed; and the life of life within, unscathed untouched, shall find itself in a new and genial sphere, with eternity for its irreversible inheritance. The soul's endless being is intelligence, rectitude, purity, love, and all goodness."

At the present time, special attacks are being made

upon the supernatural element in the mission of Christ. In this age naturalism has gone to seed; and the supernatural ideals of the Christ are absolutely essential to counteract this dangerous, materialistic tendency. The supernatural in the New Testament is in perfect harmony with the types and prophecies of the Old Testament. We naturally expect the supernatural in the New. Special attacks are being made on the miracle of the Incarnation. These miracles are in perfect harmony with the life of Christ itself. E. Griffith-Jones truly says: "The redemption of man is exactly what Christian Theology represents God's end in the Incarnation and the Resurrection. It is, in a sense, a Divinely spontaneous scheme for the re-habilitation of Fallen Creation—for in the Fall of Man the whole creation fell, since all its upward strivings were thereby for the time made of no avail. It was in another sense the Divine answer to the prayer of Fallen Humanity for help to rise again—for evil, though it had stunted and threatened to kill all good in *man*, had not quite done so. Still the redemption must come in the first instance from God; for Man had lost the power to rise independently of God's assistance; indeed, since his lapse into sin had lost the consciousness of the Divine presence through which alone he could further develop. Redemption, in other words, could no longer come primarily through the ascent of Man to God, but *mediately*, through the descent of God to Man. And so there is in Hebrew prophecy, and in the strain of the sacred bard and poet, an earnest expectation of Some One to come, who should be a starting point of a new life in God—an expectation fulfilled in the coming of Jesus Christ." The language here quoted is from an Evolutionist, and he shows that the supernatural in the New Testament is in harmony with true evolution.

The Virgin Birth seems to have given skeptical writers great difficulty. Even Schleiermacher rejected this part of the sacred narrative. Dr. Zockler, in answering Prof. Soltan, uses the following arguments: "It is already noteworthy that the author can defend his position only by an array of *argumenta ex silentia* and by extra Biblical parallels. His claim that even Paul and John were ignorant of the supernatural birth of Jesus is of surpassing

boldness and is overwhelmed by dozens of passages from their writings. The interpretation of Gal. IV, 4 is clearly wrong, and the whole superstructure is based upon the *a priori* hypothesis that the birth of Christ and the origin of Christianity are purely natural phenomena in history. And these vagaries are called 'the certain results of modern Biblical criticism.' This argumentation and these conclusions of Soltan only show again how purely subjective the modern destructive criticism of the Scriptures is, and how little objective foundation it has for its radical positions."

Science rather favors the supernatural doctrine of the Incarnation by showing that it is not altogether unnatural and that evolution affords examples of it. Prof. G. J. Romanes says; "It has been already stated that both parthenogenesis and gemmation are ultimately derived from sexual reproduction. It may now be added, on the other hand, that the earlier stages of parthenogenesis have been observed to occur sporadically in all sub-kingdoms of the Metazoa, including the Vertebrata, and even the highest class, the Mammalia. These earlier stages consist in spontaneous segmentations of the ovum, so that even if a virgin has ever conceived and borne a son, and even if such a fact in the human species has been unique, still it would not betoken any breach of physiological contiguity. Indeed, according to Weismann's not improbable hypothesis touching the meaning of polar bodies, such a fact need betoken nothing more than a slight disturbance of the complex machinery of ovulation, on account of which the ovum failed to eliminate from its substance an almost inconceivably minute portion of the nucleus." This supports the New Testament doctrine of the Incarnation, which postulates the prior existence of the Word. It also supports the doctrine of the sinlessness of the Christ. It also supports the unique position that Jesus Christ occupies in the history of the race. The Incarnation was intended for the individual and social redemption of man.

Christ predicted his resurrection. The *resurrection* really transforms the *incarnation*. It was an objective historical fact, and the true reward of the obedient Son of God. Dr. Wescott truly says: "A belief in the Resurrection

of our Lord is not indeed the solution, for that we cannot gain, but the illumination of the mysteries of life: in this fact the apparent contradictions of the immensity and insignificance of the individual are harmonized: in this lies an end to which pre-Christian history converged, a spring from which post-Christian history flows: in this man finds the only perfect consecration of his entire nature; in this there is contained a promise of the future which removes, so far as may be, the sense of isolation which belongs to our finite nature and unites the world to the absolute and eternal: in this, to sum up all briefly, we may contemplate Christianity in relation to history, to man, and to the future, not as a vague idea, or as a set of dogmas, or even as a system, but as a witness to actual events in the substantial reality of which lies all its power and all its hope." The following from E. Griffith-Jones is interesting: "Those who would limit the life and work of our Lord to the power of his example as the typical man, to the wonderful elevation and universality of His teaching, to the inspiring influence of His ideas of man, of God, and of social progress through the law of Love and Goodwill among men, and who bring the sinless life He lived to an end at the grave of Joseph of Arimathea, part company here with the distinctly Christian conception, and with the faith of Eighteen Centuries." Mr. Griffith-Jones believes that the doctrine of evolution supports the doctrine of the resurrection. He says: "The brute inheritance hinders and retards our development in a thousand ways. But the Resurrection of our Lord is an earnest that the time will come, to those who do their part in this life faithfully, when the dualism which makes life a constant struggle will be resolved into a glorious harmony, when the diverse parts of our nature will be working in perfect friendship." The Resurrection of Christ was a great historic fact, and a new departure in progressive development. It truly introduced a universal religion, and it is the most important fact in the social and spiritual evolution of the race. The triumphs and universality of the kingdom of Christ are based upon the great fact of his resurrection from the dead.

SECTION ONE

THE SUPERNATURAL WORKS OF THE CHRIST

The Ideal Life

Lecky says: "It was reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character, which, through all the changes of eighteen centuries, has filled the hearts of men with an impassioned love, and has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments, conditions; has not only been the highest pattern of virtue but the highest incentive to its practice." It is perfectly logical to state that no such character could exist which was not in full touch with the supernatural. The longing of the human heart had ever been for the ideal life, and this longing has been satisfied in the founder of Christianity. Theodore Parker says: "In him as in a mirror we may see the image of God, and go on from glory to glory, till we are changed into the same image." Thomas Carlyle says: "Our highest Orpheus, whose sphere-melody, flowing in wild, native tones, took captive the ravished souls of men, and still moderates and Divinely leads them." Schiller declares that holiness, which is the supreme thing in man, stands forever incarnate in the Christ. The following is the language of Jean Paul Richter: "The mightiest among the holy, and the holiest among the mighty, who lifted with His pierced hands empires off their hinges, turned the stream of time into new channels, and still governs all the ages." The life of Christ has been called the paradox of history, because, of its universality and at the same time individuality. It is difficult to make the universal an example for the individual; but Christianity has perfectly accomplished this. It is not difficult to imitate a character just above us, but to imitate a perfect character is a very different thing. Christianity solves the difficulty, for its founder reaches the hearts of the most humble and lowly. In the life of the Christ we have the ideal made actual. His life perfectly corresponded with his ideals. No one was ever able to convict him of sin.

The Christ united *Godhood* with *Manhood*. He was God manifested in the flesh, yet he was the model man. The following from the pen of Griffith-Jones is very appropriate just here: "This is the point at which our inquiry takes a vital hold of the doctrine of *his person*. He himself was the subject of spiritual Evolution. Just as we are told that the embryo recapitulates in the preliminary stages of the individual life, the whole history of the race, so we may reverently say that, in the stages of growth of the perfect life as seen in Jesus from the cradle to the cross, we see the pathway that would have been followed by the race if, instead of falling into sin, it had retained its innocence and gone on to perfection. In that case there would have been limitations; there would have been growth; there would have been a gradual Evolution from a partial and incomplete life to a glorious and perfect one, like the growth of the bud into the flower. *But there would have been no sin*; and in that wide difference we have the whole story of the actual as opposed to the ideal course of Man. If we study the childhood of Christ as it is scantily sketched out for us, we have a picture of the true pathway that ought to have been followed by humanity in its earlier and pre-historic career; and if we study *his* later life, we shall see not only what we ourselves ought to be individually, but also what the race might be in its relations to God and to its constituent members."

All scientists must admit that higher laws have been introduced in the evolution of life. It required special power not belonging to matter itself to originate the physical universe. In this we have the supernatural. Higher law was also required in the evolution of life; for life could not come from the lifeless. Still higher law was required in the evolution of sensation and thought. The scientific doctrine of God's immanence in nature is a clear recognition of the supernatural. While the Incarnation of the Christ was supernatural, it was not unnatural; and it was exactly what the Christian Theist might expect. Those who carefully study the life of Christ naturally expect in him the supernatural.

The miracles of the Christ are so interwoven with the Gospel narratives that to eliminate the supernatural works

of Christ is very largely to destroy the narratives. It is also interesting to observe the intimate relationship of the works of Christ as narrated by the Synoptists to the doctrine of faith itself. These supernatural signs were in order that man might believe. It is also important to note that the works of Christ were for the benefit of others; and these works especially as recorded by the Synoptists were in harmony with the predictions of the prophets. Jesus did what the prophets said the Messiah would do.

Dr. James Martineau, who has been called the saint of Theism, claims that there is nothing to render miracles incredible if they have sufficient proof. He also says that the gospel miracles are much higher and purer than the apocryphal miracles of the first century. He claims that the gospel miracles served the purpose of attracting attention to the real character of Christ. It is not a matter of much moment, according to this learned man, whether they actually occurred or not; for they plainly showed the belief that Christ was capable of working such miracles, and this is the impression that ought to be left on our minds.

Leprosy and Sin

It is claimed by some eminent critics that many of the miracles of Christ are really parables. It is probably true that some of them have a parabolic element. It should be remembered, however, that the parable is founded upon the possible and not the impossible. It shows that Christ was capable of performing exactly what is taught in the parable. The curing of the leprosy is thought by some to be parabolic in its character. It teaches that Jesus had even greater power than Elisha, who was himself supposed to foreshadow the coming Messiah. I do not for a moment question the fact that Jesus actually cured the leprosy, for the healing of the leper is recorded by all three of the Synoptists. The curing of the leprosy was a figurative presentation of the gospel, which Christ preached. Jesus could forgive sins, and this was certainly a much greater miracle than healing the leper.

The Miracles of Christ and Demonology

The curing of persons possessed with demons holds a high place in the works of the Christ. The character of the disease appears almost as wonderful as the nature of the cure. Evil spirits were believed to actually possess persons, and they were regarded as largely the cause of the disease. It is doubtless true that disease very largely results from sin, and the parties thus afflicted were possessed of a demoniacal spirit. It may be also that they were influenced by evil spirits from the unseen world. It is also true that in most cases of demoniacal possession there was an intimate relationship to our modern disease known as insanity. While there may be various causes for insanity the word itself comprehends the condition of many from whom Jesus expelled demons. If Jesus could expel the demon of sin, he certainly could also expel the demon of disease. In harmony with the spirit of Jesus, we now build asylums for such unfortunate persons, and in a very large number of cases they are cured of their diseases. This shows what a Christian civilization can do, and fulfills in some respects the saying of Jesus that his disciples would do even greater works than his. We should be careful not to try to explain away, or to put too great a limit upon the powers of the Christ. He was God manifested in the flesh.

The Nature-Miracles

Dr. Alexander B. Bruce says: "Of all the miraculous acts of Christ those in which the subject of action was inanimate nature, have ever been most exposed to skeptical assaults. The reasons of this are not difficult to discover. These events, or the chief of them, such as feeding the multitude, the change of water into wine, and the walking on the water, if miraculous at all, are so in a very high degree. They stand in no analogy with the acts of ordinary men. In the case of the healing miracles, or many of them, it is otherwise."

Dr. Bruce further says: "Without anticipating the question as to the use or function of miracles, which will

come up for discussion at a future stage, the general statement may here be made that every miraculous act of Christ must be conceived of as congruous to His Messianic vocation, and serviceable to the interests of the divine kingdom. None of the miracles, of whatever class, can be regarded as mere displays of power; they must all be viewed as arising naturally out of their occasions and serving a useful purpose in connection with Christ's work as the Herald and Founder of the kingdom of heaven. Any reputed miracle which did not satisfy this requirement would be justly liable to suspicion."

The changing of water into wine at Cana was a nature-miracle and the first of Christ's miracles. It seems to be a kind of prophecy at the beginning of his work contrasting the wine of his kingdom with the water of Judaism. The fact that it contains a parabolic element does not destroy its supernatural character. It truly represents the power of the Son of God. The glory of the coming kingdom was manifested.

Dr. Weiss, in his *Das Leben Jesu*, claims that the book of John is authentic, and that the miracle at Cana was a foreshadowing of the life of Jesus as the self-manifestation of the Logos. It certainly teaches that Jesus was a supernatural worker. This in no sense implies that he did not work in harmony with the laws of God.

The Fourth Gospel

Keim, one of the most recent and one of the greatest of rationalistic critics, in his great work the *History of Jesus of Nazareth*, claims that the Fourth Gospel was written at least fifty years earlier than the Tübingen school was disposed to admit. The critical Dr. Bernhard Weiss defends in an unanswerable way the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel. He claims that in this Gospel compared with the Synoptics, is presented a connection of important epochs in the life of Christ, such as could be known only by an eye-witness, such as was John. The time of the last passover and crucifixion, as described in John, indicates an eye-witness. Robert Browning, in his sublime poem, "A Death in the Desert," answers the skeptical arguments

of the nineteenth century in the language he puts into the mouth of the apostle John in the hour of death.

“Such is the burthen of the latest time.
I have survived to hear it with my ears,
Answer it with my lips: does this suffice?
For if there be a further woe than such,
Wherein my brothers struggling need a hand,
So long as any pulse is left in mine,
May I be absent even longer yet,
Plucking the blind eyes back from the abyss,
Tho’ I should tarry a new hundred years.”

Feeding the Five Thousand. John 6

This seems to be the only miracle recorded by all four of the Evangelists, and it is consequently of great evidential value. Among the most recent writers of what is known as the critical school are Weiss and Beyschlag. In their lives of Christ, they call this a Providential miracle. They compare the faith of Jesus to that of Abraham offering Isaac. As Abraham fully believed that God would provide an offering, or raise Isaac from the dead; so Jesus believed that his Father would feed the multitude, even if it required a creative miracle. Even they do not limit the power of God or the faith of Jesus.

It was an interesting sight to see five thousand men besides women and children, following a religious teacher. When Jesus saw the great crowd, he said to Philip, “Whence shall we find bread that these may eat?” It may be that he asked this question because Philip was slow in spiritual discernment and was well acquainted with the country as his home was at Bethsaida a neighboring town. John says that Jesus thus proved Philip. In his reply, Philip showed his spiritual obtuseness. The scantiness of the exchequer of Jesus and his disciples is also shown. The perplexing question was left with Philip until the afternoon when the disciples suggested to their Master the difficulty, to which he replied as above, and asked, “How many loaves have you?” On Andrew’s replying that a lad among the multitude had five barley loaves and two small

fishes, Jesus ordered them to be brought to him and the multitude be seated. It was in the spring, so the people were seated in squares upon the grass, and there were alleys between the companies. Jesus then returned thanks, broke the loaves, and gave to the disciples to be set before the people. The five thousand men, beside women and children, were all satisfied; and the disciples gathered up twelve baskets full of the fragments, so that nothing might be lost.

The historians offer no theory as to how the miracle was performed. They simply recite the facts and leave others to explain them. It is certain that the miracle was performed upon the loaves and not upon the people, for the fragments were more than the original bulk. We do not know whether the loaves grew in the hands of Jesus, or in the hands of the disciples, or in the hands of the multitude. The eye-witnesses of the scene do not tell us, and we cannot very well adventure an opinion. The influence of the miracle upon the people was such that they wanted to take Jesus by force and make him a king.

The great value of the miracle is still further shown by the very interesting discourse that Jesus bases upon it. In all ages of the world men have given almost exclusive attention to the bread that perisheth. They have labored for the body while the wants of the soul have been neglected. Jesus had recently fed the multitude, and they again come to him as hungry as ever. He exhorts them to seek something more permanent, not to do as men are accustomed to doing—giving attention to the life that now is, and neglecting that which is to come. He assures them that he can give them food pertaining to eternity, as the Father had sealed him. This had been done (1) by the testimony of the prophets, (2) by the heavenly voice at his baptism, (3) by the testimony of his works.

The people were interested in Jesus as the secular Messiah, and were willing to do anything he might require of them. They therefore asked him what they must do. He at once told them to believe on him, whom God had sent. No one ever asked Jesus or his disciples this important question, and failed to receive a direct answer. Faith itself is a work of God, and faith worketh by love. As the

claims of Jesus were so high, they demanded a greater sign than they had thus far had. They admitted that he had miraculously fed the five thousand; but wanted to compare this unfavorably with the feeding of Israel upon manna in the wilderness. They wanted him to give them a perpetual supply of bodily food. He answered them by showing (1) that God and not Moses fed them in the desert; (2) that the manna was only a type of the true bread from heaven. He revealed himself to them as the bread of God, who had come down from heaven to give his life unto the world.

The Jews here understood the bread of life, like the Samaritan woman understood the water of life, as some miraculous kind of sustenance. It had long been a belief among them that when the Messiah came, he would give them all kinds of delicacies. So they said, "Lord, evermore give us this bread." The bread of life is at once offered them. Jesus is the bread of life, because he is to the soul what bread is to the body. Those that come to him will not hunger. He satisfies the wants of the soul, (1) by taking away the burden of sin, (2) by giving the light of life, (3) by satisfying man's instinctive longings for a future state. Those who believe in Jesus will never thirst. There is nothing more intolerable to the body than thirst; so also of the soul, there is nothing more terrible of which we can conceive than the thirsty spirit without the righteousness of God.

God sent his son into the world to redeem it; and all can be saved, if they will accept the bread of life. God does not compel men to eat in this world, and we have no reason to suppose he will do so in the world to come. Man is a free agent, and with this free agency even God does not interfere. Man must willingly come to Christ in order to obtain eternal life. Those who come to him will obtain a glorious resurrection at the last day.

There are some very important thoughts suggested by this miracle and discourse; (1) To satisfy the wants of the body man must eat and drink; to satisfy the wants of the soul he must eat the bread of life and drink the water of life. (2) It is unhealthy for man to eat and drink too rapidly. Many have lost their lives in that way. The

same thing is true with spiritual food and drink. No one should try to appropriate all in one protracted meeting. There can be no healthy spiritual growth where such is the case. (3) A long fast is very injurious to health. The same thing is true in the kingdom of God. You do not find much spirituality in those Christians who neglect the Lord's house and the Lord's Supper. (4) If a man wishes to escape dyspepsia, he must take his meals regularly. When he gets that dreadful disease, he not only suffers, but all who are near him also suffer. By neglecting the bread of life some get the spiritual dyspepsia, and become chronic grumblers in the church of God. (5) Food must be thoroughly masticated in order to benefit the body. The bread of life must be thoroughly masticated in order to benefit man spiritually. (6) It is dangerous to health to try to eat too much at one time. So among Christians, too much zeal on the part of early converts is apt to burn up all spiritual vitality. (7) The body requires wholesome food. Poison will destroy it. So man requires the bread of life, poison will destroy the spiritual man. Falsehood is poisonous to the soul, but truth gives freedom.

The Sabbath Cure at Bethesda. John 5

Jesus had spent some time in Galilee; and when the time for another passover arrived, he went up to Jerusalem, although he had been rejected at his first visit. The passover was of special significance to him, and evidently with great delight he attended these national gatherings. Of this first visit we know of but one incident, and that was the healing of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda.

The man had been suffering for thirty-eight years, yet he seemed to think that he, in some way, would be able to master the dreadful disease. He was a man of courage, and evidently had in him some excellent traits of character. He is a good example for the correction of those who are always complaining and are destitute of patience in sickness. As a sick man wants to use every remedy about which he hears, this man had heard about the healing properties of the waters of Bethesda, and had managed, in some way, to reach the pool. He had perhaps been there only a few days when he met our Saviour.

Jesus finding him the most helpless of all that had collected there, had compassion on him. The selfishness of humanity is shown in the way in which the stronger persons treated the infirm man at the pool. That selfishness is fearfully manifested at the present time in the great trusts, and it is rapidly developing a socialistic and communistic spirit among even the great civilized nations of the world. The question of Jesus to the man was calculated to develop in him a hope of a new source of healing. Be it observed that the man was healed without any faith on his part, and this shows a great contrast between the healing power of Jesus and of those who claim the same power at the present time.

Jesus spake the word, and the man was instantly healed. Those who quote this example to prove their ability to perform similar cures, fail to recognize the difference between the Christ and themselves. He was the Son of God and claimed equality with the Father in this life-giving work. Faith on the part of the sick, will, of course, benefit them, but Jesus could even cure one who had no faith. We do not object to faith cure properly understood; but we do object to persons quoting the miracles of Christ as examples of their own ability to heal.

Jesus did not lift the man up; but told him to rise, take up his bed, and walk. The man was not without some strength, and Jesus had him make use of it. He never does for us what we can do for ourselves. While he works in us, at the same time, he requires us to work out our own salvation. The sinner is helpless; but at the same time he can feel, think, and act. These things are required at his hands in order that he may receive God's blessings. The man took up his bed, which was a small rug upon which he lay, and at once walked away. As he had crawled for thirty-eight years, and at the command of Jesus was able to walk, no one could question the genuineness of the miracle. Not even the Jewish rulers could do this, but objected to the fact that it was wrought on the Sabbath day.

The Jewish law forbade the carrying of any burden on this day except in case of necessity. The Jewish rulers were more careful about the letter than about the spirit of the law. In fact, they had perverted the law from its

true meaning. They had placed tradition above the law itself, and the law had to bend to their traditions instead of their traditions bending to the law. Their ritualism finally caused them to reject the Messiah, and to become a scattered and a humiliated people. Modern creeds have about the same effect upon Christians that tradition had upon the Jews. They cause even ministers of the gospel to reject some of the plainest statements of the Bible.

The man defended himself on the ground that his benefactor had told him to take up his bed and walk. Even the Rabbis admitted that the Sabbath might be broken at the command of a prophet. The man could argue that the one who could cure him of a disease of thirty-eight years' standing could certainly be nothing less than a prophet. The rulers did not want to hear about the cure, but the man flung it into their face. They inquired of him the party who had told him to break the Sabbath. He thinks only of benediction, while they think of crimination. Jesus had disappeared in the crowd, and the man did not know where he was. The time had not come for an open conflict with the Jews, and Jesus knew that the miracle would bring it about. He did the noble deed, left the people to publish it and disappeared.

As soon as the man was healed, he went to the temple to thank God for his recovery. He had probably been kept from the house of God thirty-eight years, and now goes up once more to worship. He finds Jesus in the Temple; those who want to find the Christ must come to the house of God. Jesus reminds the man of his cure and tells him to sin no more lest a greater calamity come upon him. The suffering of the man was doubtless caused by his sins in early life. Like many of the young of the present age he thought it proper to sow wild oats, and he had spent thirty-eight years in reaping. He is informed that if he returns to his old sins his degradation will be even greater than before. The man now knows his benefactor, and tells the Jews what Jesus had done for him.

The Jewish sects laid aside for a time their rivalry, and united in persecuting Jesus. He plainly showed his relation to the Father, and as the Father was above the

Sabbath, so was he. As the Father on the Sabbath worked for the good of man, so might also the Son. This argument added fuel to the flame, and the anger of the rulers reached a state of intense fury. They had before this sought his life, and they are constantly watching an opportunity to accomplish their murderous purpose. On his first visit to Jerusalem, Jesus showed his authority over the temple, thus anticipating his priesthood; and on his second visit, he showed his authority over the law, intimating his ability to establish a higher law. The discourses of Jesus connected with his miracles especially in the book of John, reach the very highest spiritual standpoint and show his true relationship to the Father.

Jesus and the Blind Man. John 9

The ninth chapter of John is one of the most pathetic chapters of the Bible; and its life-like character cannot fail to attract the attention of all thinking persons. It records one of the greatest miracles performed by Jesus; and the circumstances connected with it were such that even the Jews had to acknowledge its genuineness. Their last resort was to attribute it to satanic influence; but the beneficence of the work was such that the thoughtful could not be convinced that Satan had anything to do with it. He knew too much to work against himself, and thus divide his own kingdom. The candid student cannot fail to see the supernatural character of Jesus in the ninth chapter of John.

Who did sin? The Jews believed that special suffering was the consequence of special sin, and as this man had been a great sufferer, they thought that either he or his parents had been guilty of great sin. Like the comforters of Job, they were a torment to the afflicted instead of sympathizing with him. They were ever ready to pry into the secrets of others, and loved judgment better than mercy. Jesus was altogether of a different spirit. He saw the suffering man, and was anxious to relieve him. The cause of the man's condition was not then important; but the important thing was to so use it as to benefit the man and others. The language of Jesus does not imply that

the man and his parents had not been guilty of sin, but that no special sin of theirs was the cause of the man's blindness.

The time to work. The sun was then rapidly declining toward the western horizon, and Jesus made use of this fact to teach an important lesson. He constantly made use of natural phenomena to explain the spiritual character of his life and work. As the light of the day is the appointed time to work, so the life and light before the grave is the appointed time to work for God. Jesus had no time to lose, for he knew that the grave was not far in the future. The same thing is true with us; life is short, and death is certain. We must work while it is day; for the night of death will soon come, when man's work is done. While in the world, Jesus was the light of the world. As physical life and light depend upon the sun, so all spiritual life and light depend upon the Sun of Righteousness. The sun dries up the quagmire, but his beams remain pure; so the Sun of Righteousness mingled his beams with the darkest elements of unregenerate humanity, but remained himself as pure as heaven's bright king.

The Miracle. The ancients believed that the saliva of one who had broken his vow was good for weak eyes, and that clay would drive tumors from the lids. Of course they had no remedy for one who was born blind. Jesus did not ignore means in his work, but used the common remedies, and gave them efficiency by his spiritual power. The man was told to go to Siloam and wash, which he did, and was healed. This recalls the washing and healing of Naaman, the Syrian. Jesus did his part and required the man to do his. This should be a lesson to all who oppose the positive commands of Jesus and call them non-essential.

Before the Pharisees. The man that had been healed was well known in Jerusalem, for he had long been a blind beggar. The people were so startled at the man that a buzz went through the community, and some were even disposed to deny the man's identity. There is an inherent love of recognition on the part of man, and there was too much of manhood on the part of this man to lose his identity. The miracle had been wrought on the Sabbath day, and the Jews were perplexed about it. The Rabbinical law forbade a man to put spittle even on one of his own

eyes on the Sabbath. Jesus had not only put spittle on the man's eyes, but had actually mingled the saliva with clay. They felt that the law had been broken, and brought the man before the Pharisees. The man so faithfully narrated the facts concerning the cure that the Pharisees were puzzled. They sent for the parents of the man, who very soon identified him. The difficult question as to how the man had been healed was now to settle. The knowledge the people had of him, and the fact that he could see, confirmed the truth of his statement. There was no possibility of getting rid of the fact of the miracle; so the Pharisees affirmed that it was from an evil source, or it would not have been performed on the Sabbath day. Those who could look at it fairly, were satisfied that God could not give to a sinner such power. The man, on being asked his opinion, affirmed that Jesus was a prophet. This was a perfect Jewish answer and implied that Jesus had divine authority.

The Pharisees excommunicated the man because he would not deny his benefactor. Jesus found him and said, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said, And who is He Lord, that I may believe on *him*? Jesus said unto Him, Thou has both seen Him, and He it is that speaketh with thee. And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped Him. The man was healed in spirit as well as body. The inward man is diseased as well as the outward man, and the application of God's medicine to it is absolutely essential to its healing. Jesus is the Great Physician, and can heal all our infirmities. We must do our part, and he will certainly do his.

The Raising of Lazarus. John 11: 1-44

The hostility of the Jews of Judea, towards Jesus, was such that he retired unto Perea beyond the Jordan, and made his home at Bethabara the place where John had baptized. His ministry there was very successful, and it is thought that at that time he sent out the seventy. It was an interesting place to him, for the shadow of Nebo where Moses died, rested upon the valley. His Perean ministry was cut short by the news of his friend's illness.

A Friend Sick. None are exempt from sickness. A man by living up to the laws of hygiene may postpone sickness a long time, but it will ultimately come. Keep a watch in good repair, and it will run a long time, but it will finally wear out. A man may live as long as did the Apostle John and the philosopher Kant, and literally dry up; but the human system is so constituted that it must ultimately wear out. Those who talk about not having any sickness or death simply do not know what they say. As his name indicates, Lazarus was a godly man, and his house had frequently been a home for Jesus. It appears that all the family had died except a brother and two sisters, and these sisters necessarily felt greatly dependent upon that brother. Jesus was greatly attached to the family, and especially loved Lazarus. This is a very precious chapter, as it so beautifully illustrates the friendship of Jesus, and forever sanctifies true friendship.

When we are in trouble, we want our intimate friends to know it; so these girls wisely sent a very modest message to Jesus. They evidently knew the cause of his retirement, and did not want to bring him into danger; but at the same time felt that he must know the news. As soon as Jesus learns of his friend's sickness, he decides the result. His language is marvelous and shows that he understood all God's plans. The Son of God would be glorified in working the greatest miracle of his ministry; and this miracle would hasten his death, and ultimate glorification. The miracles of Christ were a self-revelation of his nature and relationship to the Father.

Jesus in Perea. While the love of Jesus for Lazarus was very great, it was under the control of reason, and not permitted to conflict with duty. He had good reason for remaining two days longer in Perea; and although Mary and Martha were in great trouble, it would all be for their good. Christians need more patience in affliction, and they should study God's will rather than their own pleasure. Our trials in this life only tend to greater joy hereafter.

When Jesus suggested the propriety of returning to Judea again, the disciples only thought of danger and death. These things did not trouble their Master. He only thought of duty, and was ready to face anything in its

way. It was doubtless early morning when they started, and this suggested the beautiful figure of walking during the day. God had given him a special time to work, and it could not be neglected or delayed under any circumstances. Jesus always worked by his Father's time-piece.

Lazarus Dead. When Jesus spake of the sleep of Lazarus the disciples were disposed to make it an excuse for remaining in Perea, on the ground that sleep indicated returning health. Sleep is a beautiful emblem of death, and is so used in the Bible. As the returning day awakes man from the sleep of night, so the day of judgment will awake him from the sleep of death.

The conscious spirit will not sleep
In a grave of dreamless night;
But will bring even from the deep,
The body into endless light.

Jesus told them that Lazarus, who was their friend as well as his, was actually dead. He expressed his gratitude that Providence had so arranged affairs that he was absent from Judea during the sickness of his friend. He thus intimates that he would have healed Lazarus of his sickness; and the miracle would not, of course, have been as great as raising him from the dead. Nothing appeals so powerfully to the imagination, as raising the dead. The resurrection of Christ is the most substantial evidence we have of a future life. It satisfies, as can nothing else, the universal longings of the human heart.

The longings of the human soul,
Are God-like germs that will grow,
Until man's fondest hopes unfold
A heavenly fruitage unknown below.

The despondent Thomas expresses a willingness to go along, but anticipates fatal consequences. He was disposed to look on the dark side of things; but was a man of fact, and looked not at imaginary but at real dangers. Thomas was a brave man, and it if was necessary to face death, he had nerve enough to do it. He truly loved his Master, and was willing to die with him.

We reach the highest point in the personal ministry of Christ. The raising of Lazarus was the greatest of his miracles, and was a prelude to his own resurrection. The philosopher, Spinoza, declared that if he could believe that Jesus raised Lazarus, he would tear to shreds his own philosophic system, and accept the creed of Christians. His early creed in opposition to Christianity was really more in the way of his accepting Christ than was his philosophy. The theories of skeptics to explain away this grand miracle have been so inconsistent that the thoughtful have been compelled to reject them. They are not in harmony with what these writers have declared to be the character of Christ. The narrative has the true marks of authentic history, and the true historian has no right to reject it.

Conversation with the Sisters. Martha was more active than Mary, and could much better overcome grief. While Mary was quietly meditating upon her bereavement, Martha was trying in some way to throw hers off. It is not surprising therefore that she was the first to learn of the presence of Jesus, and went to see him. The faith of these girls in Jesus was such that they satisfied themselves that his presence would have been sufficient to drive away the ruthless invader. On Martha's so expressing herself to Jesus, he assured her that her brother would rise again. Under the circumstances she could not well do more than refer this to the general resurrection. Her faith in Jesus was great, but it needed strengthening. She believed that what he asked God to do would be done; but it was necessary for her to realize that the one to whom she talked had power in himself to raise the dead; that all believers in him would be raised to a higher life, and would triumph over death. Martha expressed her faith in him as the *King—Messiah*, and went to call her sister. On account of the hostility of the Jews present, to Jesus, Martha quietly informed her sister that Jesus had come, and wanted to see her. Mary hastened to him, and prostrated herself before him. Martha had faith in Jesus, but Mary so loved him that to her he was everything. She does not even suggest her wants, but leaves everything to her divine Master. She only expressed in words the burden that had been upon

her heart ever since the death of her brother. She and her sister had evidently talked it over, for their introductory words were the same.

The Sympathy of Jesus. When Mary went to meet her Lord, the Jews followed, supposing that she was going to weep at her brother's grave. When Jesus saw her weeping, and also the Jews weeping, he groaned in his spirit and was troubled. His groans expressed his indignation at the hypocritical tears of the Jews, and he was troubled when he thought what sin had done for the world. On reaching the grave Jesus also wept. He did not seek to dry up altogether the stream of sorrow in this world, but to bound it and keep in within its banks. Jesus only wept on two other occasions; one over Jerusalem, and the other when on the cross. The tears at the grave of Lazarus belong to the home, those over Jerusalem to the Jewish nation, and those on the cross to the whole world.

Lazarus Raised. Jewish sepulchres were out of town, and were either natural caverns, or artificial ones hewn out of solid rock, with recesses in the side where the dead were laid. The door was closed with a large stone to keep away beasts of prey. When Jesus commanded the stone to be taken away, Martha objected on the ground that the body had been buried long enough to become offensive. The Jews claimed that death was caused by a drop of gall falling from the sword of an angel, and that on the fourth day decay commenced, so that the spirit departed to return no more until the resurrection. Jesus gently reproved Martha for a lack of faith, and assured her of the consequence of a proper exercise of it.

They removed the stone which was all they could do. God requires man to do his part. The raising of Lazarus had been determined before leaving Perea, and the prayer, which he here offers to the Father was especially designed for those present. When Jesus spake the word Lazarus came forth, and all the sweet memories of the past illuminated his countenance.

The conscious memory does outlive
The changes of every seven years' span,
If God does to it such powers give,
Why not it survive the age of man.

The vivid imagination of Homer preserved from decay the body of a hero, only for noble burial. God does not forget his heroes, and looked after the body of the faithful Lazarus until it was reanimated by the conscious spirit. Robert Browning represents Lazarus as living after this a dazed life. This is not surprising, for both Paul and John were dazed by the light of the unseen. They lived in the future world as well as in the present. We should live for eternity as well as time. The loud voice that brought Lazarus from the grave will be heard again (I Thess. 4: 16, I Cor. 15: 52); then all that are in their graves will come forth. A spiritual body will be raised, one that is exactly adapted to the spirit. Conscious identity will have been preserved by the spirit; so when it enters the spiritual body, all the sweet memories will be perfectly vivid before the mind. Not only will the friends of the past be remembered, but many things forgotten in this world will be brought back to the mind, as man will then have a body which will not impede the activity of the mind.

Thought will survive the shock of death,
It mingles not with lifeless clay;
So when man breathes his latest breath,
The soul departs for endless day.

The Risen Christ. John 20:1-29

While the Romans permitted their victims to remain on the cross until devoured by vultures, the Jewish law required the dead to be buried even in the most extreme cases. The legs of the associated victims with Jesus, were broken in order that they might die and be buried before the Passover Sabbath; but when they came to Jesus they found him dead already, and did not break his legs; thus fulfilling the Passover symbol; that not a bone should be broken. Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus took the cold, pulseless body of Jesus, and having embalmed it sufficiently for the Sabbath, placed it in the new tomb of Joseph.

Mary of Magdala hastens to the Sepulchre. After the burial, the pious women went immediately to make pre-

parations for the completion of embalming the body after the Sabbath. It was a lonely Sabbath for the humble disciples of Jesus. It was also somewhat distressing for those who had taken part in the execution. The Holy of Holies had always been darkened by a veil, except once a year, when the high priest entered it on the day of atonement. The phenomena at the crucifixion, and the veil rent from top to bottom, could not fail to strike terror to those who wore sacerdotal garments.

Mary and her associates doubtless slept without the city walls, so that when day began to dawn they were on their way to the sepulchre. Mary of Magdala preceded the rest, and it is to her that John gives his special attention. Before she reached the tomb, God had sent his shining messengers, and during a terrible shaking of the earth they rolled the stone away from the sepulchre. When Mary discovered that the body was gone, she hastened at once to Peter and John in order to inform them of the fact. In her absence, the other women saw the angels and were informed by them that Jesus had risen from the dead.

Peter and John ran to the tomb. It seems that Peter and John were at this time living together, and Mary, the mother of Jesus, was the honored guest of the latter. When these apostles are informed of the empty tomb, they hasten to learn more about the statement of Mary Magdalene. The two Marys would also naturally insist on their going in a hurry. As John was the younger he outran Peter, and reached the sepulchre first. He was also more cautious and timid than his older companion, and did not at first venture into the tomb. The impulsive Peter did not hesitate, but went immediately into the sepulchre. He found the tomb without a body. The linen garment that had covered the body, and the napkin that had been placed around the head, were folded up separately. Nothing indicated that the grave had been rifled, but rather that it had been visited by friends.

The facts convinced John that Jesus had risen from the dead. Thus far they had not understood what the Scriptures taught about the resurrection of the Messiah. When John reached the conclusion that he had risen, then the sayings of Jesus in reference to the resurrection, and the

teaching of the Bible on the subject, would naturally flash upon his mind. To him now it is quite plain that Jesus has risen from the dead. While he and Peter went to discuss the question with the other disciples, the women lingered about the tomb of the one whom they loved. There is nothing else so pathetic as the weeping of a woman at the grave of her dead.

Jesus Appears to Mary. The affection of Mary for Jesus appears to have been even greater than that of the other women. She had been greatly afflicted, and he had cast out of her seven demons; but there is no evidence that she was ever a woman of immoral character. Her great excitement about the terrible catastrophe that had befallen them, made her unconscious of fear; and while she was gazing into the sepulchre, she saw two angels, one at the head, and the other at the foot of the sepulchre. Jesus had been crucified between two thieves, but when in the grave, he was between two angels. The shining messengers inquired the cause of her grief, and were ready to comfort her.

Mary, feeling that some one was near, half turned away, and saw one whom, from the peculiarity of his dress, she supposed to be the gardener. He also inquired the cause of her weeping; and she supposing that he really understood this, proposed, if he had borne away the body, she would take charge of it herself, and be responsible for a proper burial. Jesus addressed her in his formally pathetic way by the simple name of Mary. She immediately recognized him, and cried in her native Aramaic, "Rabboni!" "O, my, Master." She would, of course, have lingered there; but Jesus gently checked her enthusiasm by telling her not to cling to him, as he had for her a more important work. He made her an apostle to the apostles to inform them that he had risen from the dead, and that she, herself, had actually seen him.

On the first day of the week, when the disciples had assembled in the upper room to worship, Jesus appeared to them, and fully convinced them that he had risen from the dead. Thomas was not present, and when informed by the other disciples, declared that he would not believe unless he could have the most positive evidence of the

senses. The next first day of the week, Jesus appeared to him, and gave him the evidence he had demanded; and this forever banished all skepticism from the mind of Thomas.

The circumstances connected with the resurrection of the Christ, preclude the supposition of some modern skeptics that he was in a swoon, and not actually dead. His heart was pierced with a spear, which could not otherwise than cause death. The apostles handled him after he had risen, and knew that he had actually been dead. The resurrection of the Christ, clearly shows the reality of the unseen world. He knew Mary and Thomas by name, and also the other disciples. We will doubtless, know our friends by name in that unseen country to which we are all rapidly tending.

SECTION TWO

The Divine Teacher

The Kingdom of God, as taught by the Christ, was composed of those godly in character; of those who had been born from above. Jesus came into this world to save the people from their sins (Matt. 1: 2).

1. *The Beginning of the Kingdom of God.* I understand the expression Kingdom of Heaven and Kingdom of God's Dear Son to mean practically the same thing as Kingdom of God. These expressions are sometimes used interchangeably with the Church of God. John the Baptist, who came to prepare the way of the Lord, proclaimed the near approach of the Kingdom of Heaven (Matt. 3: 2). When John was baptizing the people in the river Jordan, Jesus went to him to be baptized in order to fulfill all righteousness (Matt. 3: 16-17); and God spake from the very heavens in approbation of this act. Immediately after his baptism, Jesus was driven into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil, (Matt. 4: 1-11). The severest test was the offer of the kingdoms of this world on the condition that Jesus would worship Satan. Jesus, at once, drove from him the great adversary, and the angels of God

came and ministered unto him. After the imprisonment of John, Jesus went into Galilee preaching that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand (Matt. 4: 17). Jesus had in view a kingdom very different from any that had ever existed in this world. When he came into the parts of Caesarea Philippi, he asked the disciples the views of the people concerning him; and he, then, wanted to know their own views. When Simon Peter declared that he was the Christ, the Son of the Living God, Jesus said that he would build his church upon this declaration, and give unto Peter the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven (Matt. 16: 13-19). After the death of Jesus, Joseph of Arimathaea, who also waited for the Kingdom of God, took part in the burial of his Master (Mk. 15: 43). When Jesus met with his disciples after the resurrection, they asked him to restore the kingdom to Israel (Acts 1: 6). Jesus only reminded them of the power which would soon come upon them to make them preachers among all nations. (Acts 1: 7-8). This brings us to the day of Pentecost.

It is evident that the Kingdom of God was established on the day of Pentecost, for after this time it is spoken of as an established fact (Col. 1: 13, Rev. 1: 9). The world is destined to be ultimately conquered by this kingdom, and then comes God's eternal kingdom. Even this earth is to be so purified that it will become a habitation for the righteous. I do not understand that they will be confined to this earth, but can make their abode wherever they please throughout the great universe of God.

2. *The Nature and Principles of the Kingdom of God.* The Nature and Principles of the Kingdom of God are found in the Sermon on the Mount, which is the constitution of the Commonwealth of Heaven. The Nature of the Kingdom is shown in the beautiful Beatitudes of Jesus. The keynote is sounded in the first Beatitude, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Jesus teaches that a man's happiness does not depend so much upon his outward condition as upon his character; not so much upon what he has, as upon what he is.

It is a principle of the Kingdom of God that the spirit is more than the letter. Man's spiritual condition should be such that his word would be as good as his bond. Oaths

should not be necessary in God's kingdom. While the letter of the law taught love for neighbor, the spirit of it teaches love for all. Christians should rise to that spiritual condition which sends rain upon the unjust as well as the just. It is only as citizens of God's spiritual Kingdom that we are able to love our enemies. It is a fundamental principle of the Kingdom of God that the inner is greater than the outer. The prayer that shows a true inner, spiritual condition is greatly superior to the outward, ostentatious prayer. The alms that show a true, inward brotherly love are greatly superior to the alms that are intended simply for the praise of men. Still further, it is a principle of God's Kingdom that trust is greatly superior to anxiety. Many, even Christians, worry themselves to death. Jesus taught us the better way of trust. This lesson is well illustrated by the birds of the air and the flowers of the earth.

3. *Entrance into the Kingdom of God.* The conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus, recorded in the third chapter of John, occurred sometime before the Sermon on the Mount, and the disciples evidently understood the conditions of initiation into the Kingdom of God. Jesus in his great sermon had impressed upon their minds the duties and responsibilities of true citizens of his kingdom. He is now prepared to extend the invitation to all, who are ready to assume the responsibilities. He presents only two ways: first, the strait way of duty, leading to life; and the broad way of self-indulgence, leading to death. It would require great effort on the part of those entering the narrow gate; but those passing through the wide gate, without any effort, would gradually gravitate to destruction. It would be well for all persons at the present time to study very carefully the great lessons the Saviour teaches just here; for there are at this time multitudes, who make no effort to pursue the path of self-restraint, but pass rapidly down the Broadway of self-indulgence. All persons who teach and encourage sensualistic living will be held strictly responsible by the God of this universe, who will judge all according to their deeds. The character of all will be known by their fruits.

How different indeed is the Kingdom of God from all

other Kingdoms. Napoleon at St. Helena clearly portrayed this difference. No one except the *divine teacher* could have presented to the world the nature and principles of such a kingdom. Jesus made no mistake when he said, "My kingdom is not of this world." While not of this world, no other kingdom has done so much for the progress of civilization. The kingdoms of this world will yet come under the subjection of Christ's kingdom. He will reign victorious over the heavens and earth most glorious.

The Divine Teacher at the Well. John 4:5-42

After his baptism, Jesus spent most of his time, for one year, in Judea; but the opposition of the Jewish rulers became so bitter that it was necessary for him, at least for a time, to leave the country. While in Judea he carried on a preparatory work similar to that of John the Baptist. He and his disciples taught and baptized multitudes, thus preparing them for the coming kingdom. His miracles had so attracted the people that the rulers saw in him a greater rival than they had had in the Baptist, and as his hour had not yet come, he saw proper to retire to Galilee, his early home. The very strict Jews passed around Samaria in going to Galilee, but through Samaria was the nearest route, and as Jesus had a message to the Samaritans through Samaria he went.

At the time that John was cast into prison, Jesus left Judea for Galilee, and he reached Sychar about the middle of the second day. The word city was used rather loosely for a walled town, which towns or villages were found upon almost every hill-top in Palestine. The parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph, mentioned by John, rests mainly upon tradition, yet tradition is supported by Genesis 33: 19, where we find Jacob buying a field near Shechem, and Joshua 24: 32, where it is stated that Joseph's bones were laid, and that it became the inheritance of the children of Joseph. The Old Testament gives no account of Jacob's well, but it is not at all improbable that when the patriarch returned from Padanaram with great flocks and herds, and purchased land near Shechem, that he should also dig a well, and not be dependent upon his neighbors

for a supply of water. Jacob used great wisdom in buying him a home, for Shechem is the center of Palestine, and the central position of trade from north and south. It was the place selected by Abraham when he came out of Chaldea, and it was also the first capital of the Israelitish nation. It is yet a beautiful and flourishing place, noted for its cotton factories. During our civil war, when cotton could not be gotten from the South, a good deal of it was manufactured at Shechem.

When Jesus reached Jacob's well, he was wearied with his journey, and sat by the well about noon. Our Saviour traveled on foot, and got tired, as we get tired. We never read of his traveling in a carriage, nor upon a beast except once. While at Jacob's well he teaches us how to employ even our hours of recreation. It has always been the custom in Palestine for the women to carry the water, so while Jesus was at the well a woman came to draw from it a jar of water. The disciples had gone into the town to purchase such articles as Jewish custom would permit them to buy of the Samaritans, and Jesus being thirsty, asked drink at the hands of the woman.

The woman was surprised at this on account of the hostility that existed between the Jews and the Samaritans. While the Jews would to some extent trade with the Samaritans they had no social intercourse with them. The hatred between the two peoples was caused (1) because the Samaritans were of heathen origin and a mongrel race; (2) The Samaritans bitterly opposed the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple, and established a rival temple and worship upon Mt. Gerizim; (3) Samaria became a place of refuge for refractory Jews, and the Jews looked upon the religious and civil polity of the Samaritans as a complete counterfeit of Judaism. While the woman recognized Jesus in his physiognomy, dress and speech as a Jew, his conversation to her was so charming that she also recognized in him a character so greatly superior to that of other men, that she did not hesitate to ask of him the water that would prevent her ever thirsting any more. Had she been a Jewess she would doubtless have understood the metaphor "water" and "living water" so frequently mentioned by the prophets, but she was a Samaritan,

and rejected all the Bible except the Pentateuch. By an apparently casual request Jesus reached the inner life of the woman, and convinced her of sin. She perceived that he was a prophet, and commenced a discussion about the place of worship. While Jesus insisted upon the superiority of Judaism, and that salvation was of the Jews, he informed her that the place of worship was no longer important, but the important thing was the object and spirit of worship. True worship can no longer be confined Gerizim or Moriah, but those that sincerely love God, will worship him in spirit and truth. The woman not fully understanding the language of Jesus, said that she knew all these things would be made plain when the Messiah came. He at once informed her that he was the Messiah. She was so rejoiced that she left her water-pot and went into the village, feeling fully assured that she had found him who was the Way, the Truth and the Life.

The fourth chapter of John contains revolutionary ideas. It introduces a new epoch in the spiritual history of the race. It is a declaration of man's equality before God, and tends to destroy those race prejudices which have been so greatly in the way of the progress of civilization. The place of worship is no longer the important thing, whether it be Jerusalem or Gerizim; but the spiritual condition of the individual is the important thing. God respects not individuality, but the character of the men and women who profess to love him. When the disciples returned from Sychar, where they had gone to buy bread, they were greatly astonished to find Jesus conversing with a woman at Jacob's well. They had been brought up Jews and they could not see how Jesus could converse with the Samaritan woman. It required one greater than themselves to enlarge their thoughts and sympathies in reference to the relation of all nations to God. They learned slowly, and even after the resurrection of Christ it required a miracle to induce the greatest of the apostles to preach to the Gentiles. Jesus was brought up a Jew, and had he not been the son of God he could not have had those high conceptions of the kingdom of God which have completely revolutionized the nations.

The Woman a Missionary

On their return the disciples were surprised to find Jesus talking with a woman at all, and especially with a Samaritan woman. It was against Jewish custom for a man to salute a woman in public, even his own wife; and the Rabbis declared that "it was better that the words of the law should be burned than delivered to a woman." Jesus elevated woman and made her a suitable companion for man. On this occasion he made her a missionary.

When the disciples came and interrupted the conversation between Jesus and the woman, she went into the city to proclaim the glad tidings that had that day greeted her ears. As a pledge of her return, she left the water-jar behind. When she reached Sychar, she said to the men of the city, "Come, see a man which told me all things that I ever did. Can this be the Christ?" The missionary spirit of the woman is worthy of attention. When she had found the Messiah herself, she was anxious for others to come and get acquainted with him. Her manner was gentle, for she had invited them to come and see for themselves. Origen calls this woman the apostle of the Samaritans.

Spiritual Food

After the departure of the woman, the disciples urged Jesus to take some food. He had become so interested in the great work of his mission that he did not even desire bodily food. "I have meat that you know not." The disciples did not understand him, and began to inquire if any one had brought him food. Men are slow in looking from the material to the spiritual. Nicodemus did not understand spiritual things, and the disciples did not understand spiritual food.

Jesus calls the conversion of the lost his meat. His meat and drink was to do his Father's will, and to accomplish his work. Duty, hope and success are forces which lift us above appetite. They cause the soldier to forget his wounds, and they make the martyr smile at the lion. They have food to eat that others do not understand.

The love of God
Our wants supplies,
From his unfailing fullness;
He gives us bread for bodily food,
And spiritual food from heaven.

The Harvest

“Say not ye”—the emphatic word is “ye.” It follows out the contrast between natural and spiritual food. Outer facts are signs of inner truths. The disciples spake in the language of outer facts, but Jesus in the language of spiritual realities. While in material things it was ordinarily four months from sowing time to the time of reaping, in spiritual things this was not true, for he could point them to multitudes then coming from the city to hear the words of eternal life.

One sows and another reaps. The prophets, John the Baptist, and especially Jesus himself, did much sowing, that the apostles might do much reaping. Philip, Peter and John reaped a great harvest in Samaria when many of the Samaritans believed, repented and were baptized; but it was largely the result of the sowing that Jesus had done. One man sows in tears and does not see much result; another comes along and reaps a great harvest. Let both rejoice together. On the monument of Charles Wesley was inscribed the following sentence: “God buries his workmen, but carries on his works.”

Jesus the Christ

The Samaritans were more ready to accept the divinity of Christ than were the Jews, or even the disciples themselves. The Jews had rejected the testimony of their own scriptures, of the Baptist and that of Christ's miracles. The Samaritan accepted the testimony of the woman who had suddenly become an apostle to them. Jesus was invited to abide with them, and he remained two days. They thus learned from his own lips the words of eternal life. A careful study of the fourth chapter of John will convince any judicial mind that Jesus was a divine teacher.

Jesus and Abraham. John 8:21-59

Jesus was still in Jerusalem attending the feast of Tabernacles. He appears to have remained in or near the city until the feast of Dedication, which was two months later. He clearly saw the Pharisees did not understand their own Scriptures, and that they were so prejudiced and bigoted that they were determined that no one else should understand them. The only plan seemed to antagonize the vicious rulers, and depend for the triumph of the truth among the people. This has been called the Judean ministry of Jesus; but his teaching, at this time, largely consisted in discussion with the Pharisees.

The Truth and Freedom. In the heat of controversy, some will side with a man, but will go no further. So in the controversy of Jesus with the rulers, there were quite a number, who were nominally his disciples; but they did not understand the true spiritual character of his mission. They were in favor of making him their secular Messiah. It was necessary for them to continue in his words, and make them the ruling principles of life. If they would do this, then, they would understand the true object of life's mission.

The Truth gives Freedom. Many political partisans imagine that they are advocates of liberty, when in reality they are slaves to a party. They are far from political truth, and just as far from political liberty. The Jews claimed that they had never been in bondage, and were at that very time political slaves to the Romans. Prejudice and bigotry will make men slaves at any time. Some are slaves to a religious creed or party. Protestants protested against the tyranny of Rome, yet many have made themselves slaves to human creeds. They are blinded by these as the Jews were by their traditions.

The truth referred to by Jesus is the gospel. It tends to freedom in every sense. The nations that are most under its influence enjoy the greatest amount of liberty. Compare Christian nations with heathen nations and you will understand what I mean. No nation can have even the highest political freedom without the gospel. Christianity

gives liberty to the individual. It truly gives freedom to man, woman and child. The gospel frees the individual from the guilt and pollution of sin. The man who commits sin is a slave, and nothing except the gospel can completely free him from degrading habits. Evil habits bind their victims as if bound by fetters of brass. Take for example the inebriate, who has become the victim of a burning and controlling appetite. He may sign pledge after pledge, and is almost certain to break them unless he becomes a Christian. Christianity can, however, make a bad man good, and make a drunkard a sober man. I was deeply impressed with this thought when hearing John B. Gough and Francis Murphy lecture.

Slaves of the Devil. The exhortation of Jesus was in vain, and these rulers showed themselves totally unworthy to be his disciples. The tree is known by its fruit, and their conduct clearly showed that they were children of the evil one. Jesus fully understood their murderous intentions, and could trace their lineage back to their legitimate father. Whatever might be their claims, their hatred of the truth related them to the devil, the father of lies. The greatest of German poets claims that there can be nothing gained by denying the reality of the devil, for the devil is evidently in man. If there is no tempter without, then man becomes the greater sinner, for he takes the devil within him. That these Jews were fully possessed of satan can be readily seen by all who study this narrative.

"Which of you convicteth me of sin?" This question was put by Jesus nearly two thousand years ago, and it yet awaits an answer. You seldom find a skeptic who does not compliment the life of the Christ. Not one word can be said by the most critical against his moral character. There are two classes in the world; those for God, and those against him. Those who are for God will hear his Son. They saw their predicament and called him a Samaritan. He very clearly answered them on that point, and they felt completely beaten.

Christ before Abraham. Jesus promises eternal life to all true believers. Socrates from the philosophical standpoint thought that there must be a future state. In all ages man has had instinctive anticipation of a future state.

The Christ has fully brought to light life and immortality. Death has been conquered, and made a friend instead of an enemy. It is now simply an introduction into the joys and glories of a never ending life.

The Jews did not understand the argument of Jesus. Abraham was the greatest man in the world to them, and as he died they thought that all men must die. In offering Isaac, Abraham saw the day of Christ, for the victim offered was a type of the Christ.

It is useless for men to write on the moral character of Jesus and deny his divinity. If he was not divine he was an impostor. If he was what Strauss and Renan claimed that he was, he was certainly divine. He was the "I am" before Abraham, and as the "I am" he died upon the cross. He was the divine teacher.

The Divine Teacher on the Good Shepherd. John 10:1-18

The beautiful allegory before us is immediately connected with the preceding chapter. The Pharisees had cast the blind man out, and Jesus had taken him in. They had, by their bad conduct, shown themselves totally unfit to be the shepherds of God's people. They were destitute of sympathy, and cared nothing about the sufferings of the flock. They had even denounced as the work of satan, the beneficence of the work of one who had given sight to a blind man. They had actually gone so far as to turn out of the synagogue the man who had been healed, because he would not turn traitor to his benefactor. Instead of being God's shepherds, they had become the shepherds of satan, and rejoiced in iniquity instead of rejoicing in the truth.

The True Shepherd

The ancient sheepfold was an open inclosure, walled in so as to confine the sheep at night, and ordinarily it was sufficient to keep away wild beasts. Sometimes, however, wild animals would become so hungry that they would scale the walls, and then came the trying time for the shepherd. None but a true shepherd would bear the test.

When the shepherd was tired at night he would leave the flock with a porter who closed the door and slept with the sheep. The next morning the shepherd would appear at the door, awaken the porter who knew his voice, and would open the door to admit him. If any one tried to climb over the wall the porter knew that he was a thief and a robber, and get ready to resist the attack. John the Baptist was the porter who introduced the true shepherd to his flock, and denounced the false shepherds that were rapidly devouring the sheep. The Pharisees had been denounced by John as a generation of vipers, and Jesus in this beautiful lesson shows the thievish intentions of these would-be shepherds.

The sheep know the voice of the true shepherd. Travelers have tried the experiment of exchanging clothing with shepherds, thinking that they could then lead the sheep; but the sheep would pay no attention to them. The shepherd could not so disguise himself that the sheep would not know him. Christians ought to be equally familiar with Jesus, the True Shepherd.

Jesus, the Door

The Pharisees, who claimed to have entered by Moses, had rejected the words of Moses in reference to a prophet like unto himself. The true shepherds that had gone before spake of the life and work of Jesus. The Pharisaic rulers were false shepherds, and had made void God's laws by their traditions.

It is frequently said that baptism is the door into the church. This is not strictly scriptural. Christ is the door and baptism is a condition of coming into Christ. In this way Paul says you put on Christ, and those who have put on Christ have certainly come into the church of Christ. When a penitent believer is baptized into Christ, by virtue of that fact, he becomes a member of the church of Christ. When a number of persons have been scripturally baptized at any point, these persons constitute the church of Christ at that place, although much may yet be necessary to set that church in order.

The Good Shepherd

As the good shepherd of the east watched over his flock during the bright, starry nights, he became greatly attached to these dumb animals. The faithful shepherd would die rather than have his flock scattered and destroyed. David slew a lion and a bear in defense of his father's flock. It was as great a disgrace for a shepherd to abandon his flock as for a Spartan to flee from the field of battle. It was only a hireling who would fail to brave danger in defense of his sheep.

Hirelings had gotten possession of the flock of God, and were acting the part of thieves and robbers. Jesus knew the danger he would have to encounter, and that he would have to give his life for the sheep. In this beautiful allegory, we have portrayed the result of our Saviour's faithful life. He knew the character of his enemies, and could plainly foresee the end.

Other Sheep

Jesus here refers to the Gentiles that would hear his voice, follow him, and become part of his flock. The Gentiles were of course, brought in by the apostles; but what Jesus did through his servants, he did himself. We have here an intimation of the universal character of Christianity, which was to become the religion of all races. The gospel is for no particular race, but for all nations. It is a strong evidence of the divine character of Christianity, in the fact that the nations of the world were prepared for its reception.

Reflections

1. The true shepherd may be known by the way in which he enters the sheepfold. While thieves and robbers climb over the wall, he always enters by the door.

2. The sheep instinctively know the voice of the true shepherd. If Christians will study men in the light of God's word, they will know the true from the false.

3. The true shepherd knows his sheep by name. It is said that Alexander the Great knew the name of every man in his vast army. That is one cause of his military success. The shepherds of the church should be well acquainted with the people to whom they minister.

4. The true shepherd leads. There are too many under shepherds that try to drive. A godly man can lead the people, but they cannot be driven.

5. Christ is the door to all God's blessings. God has given no other name by which we may be saved. Man cannot save himself, but God can save him through Jesus Christ our Lord.

6. Jesus promises an abundance to those who belong to his flock. "By me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and shall find pasture." The Lord's work as a shepherd is beautifully described in the the twenty-third Psalm, which Psalm all should commit to memory.

7. Jesus was to be a shepherd differing from all his predecessors in the fact that his flock would comprehend both Jews and Gentiles. The Christianity of the Bible is for all nations, and the gospel is to be preached to every human being.

The Divine Teacher on Humility. John 13:1-17

Jesus had spoken of the Passover as the season of his death. The disciples had probably supposed that he would eat it at Bethany, which the Rabbis had decided was within the bounds of Jerusalem. The plans of Jesus, however, were otherwise, for he, the true Paschal Lamb, was to be sacrificed once and forever in the Holy City, where, on that day, more than two hundred thousand lambs of which he was the antitype were destined to be slain. Peter and John were sent into the city to make preparation, and a sign was given them by which they could know where to prepare it.

Jesus Washing the Disciples' Feet

The two disciples sent by Jesus into the city, found every thing as he had predicted, and they made ready the Pass-

over. In the evening when the gathering darkness would prevent all needless observations, Jesus and his disciples walked from Bethany over the old familiar road to Jerusalem, over which his sacred feet were not destined again to traverse until after his resurrection. We soon find the little company in that upper room, perhaps the same room where the sorrowing disciples met their risen master, and where the Pentecostal tongues rested upon the brow of each.

The disciples and their Lord recline around the table which had been prepared. Each one leans upon his left elbow that the right hand might be free. When we compare Jewish customs with the still existing fashions of the changeless East, how different indeed was everything from the way in which it is pictured to us by the great Leonardo and other artists. The positions of the disciples at the feast had doubtless stirred in their minds the old dispute as to who should be greatest. This difficulty yet exists in human nature. Jesus had on previous occasions tenderly rebuked this tendency on the part of his disciples.

Jesus wishes to make a deep impression upon their minds, and leave a lesson for his disciples forever; so when they had laid aside their sandals, and none had offered to wash from their feet the accumulated dust, he laid aside his upper coat, put on the girdle of a slave, and performed the menial service. The disciples filled with awe and shame kept silent until he came to Peter, but the emotions of the impulsive apostle could not be repressed.

Simon's Objection

When Jesus came to Simon Peter, this apostle determined that his Master should not be a slave for him, and really became rebellious. Jesus gently informed him that submission was necessary, in order to have part in his spiritual kingdom. These words changed the whole current of Peter's thought and feeling, and he wanted his head as well as his feet washed. As Jesus did not let the apostles say what he should not do, nor does he allow Peter to dictate what he shall do. The washing of the whole body had already been accomplished, and was not now necessary. The baptism of his initiation was over, and he had already

been dipped in the laver of regeneration. They were all clean except the traitor to whom the Master alluded.

The Lesson of Humility

After Jesus had washed their feet and wiped them with the towel, which he had used for a girdle, he again took his place at the table. What wonderful humility when we remember that he knowingly washed the traitor's feet! His gentle hands had, with refreshing water, taken the dust from those feet that had accumulated it as they passed over Olivet's brow to a company of sanctimonious murderers. What a rebuke indeed is this to those high headed disciples who will not partake of the Lord's supper, because they think unworthy persons are present. It may be that they are the most unworthy of all.

The lesson to the disciples was, if the Master could so humiliate himself, what should the servant do? If their Lord, who sent them as apostles, could perform such menial service, how could they be contending about who should be the greatest in the coming kingdom? If the Lord and Master could so treat his servants and disciples, how ought they to treat one another?

The Lord has here taught a lesson of humility that should never be forgotten. It is the true pathway to happiness and to glory. Man is never so happy as when he is serving others. Those who work for the welfare of humanity, as did Jesus, enjoy most in this world, and they are certainly the best prepared for the world to come.

What God commands
Must be done;
So honest labor is divine,
And those that toil
Should not repine;
For all is one,
Whether on the earth or in the sun.

The Divine Teacher Warning Judas and Peter
John 13:21-38

Jesus is still at the supper with his disciples, and his mind is clouded and spirit troubled because of the traitor.

The scene afforded the celebrated Italian artist, Leonardo da Vinci, material for his masterpiece. He represents John, Peter and Judas as being on the right of Jesus. John is nearest and leans towards Peter, who stretches behind Judas to speak to the beloved disciple. Judas is on the right hand of John, and between him and Peter. In every feature of his murderous face, which cost Leonardo a year's study among the vile, declares him to be a traitor. Da Vinci, like nearly all artists, who have painted the Lord's supper, makes the mistake of representing the guests as sitting rather than reclining. From the time of the captivity, the Jews always followed the Persian style of reclining at meals on couches.

The Traitor Pointed Out

As David's friend had become David's foe, so it would be with David's son, for one of his own disciples would betray him. The hypocritical smile of Judas, while greed and treachery were in his heart, wring from Jesus the distinct prediction that one of the twelve would betray him. Their hearts almost failed them while they listened, and a deep sadness fell upon the sacred feast.

As threatening crimson intermingles with the colors of the setting sun, so a dark omen seemed to overshadow them and a presentiment of evil fell heavily upon them. It appeared that all their hopes were to be blasted, and instead of having a glorious and triumphant kingdom, even one of their number would prove traitor to their divine leader. Rapidly there crowded upon their memory "every evil thought they ever thought, or every evil word they ever said, and every evil thing they ever did."

With pale cheeks and faltering lips each asks the solemn question, "Lord, is it I?" Much better is this question than the question, "Is it he?" Better is the humility of even a Publican than the censorious pride of a Pharisee. The disciples did not suspect one another, and even Judas had so concealed his hypocritical heart under the cover of a gracious smile, that they did not think of him as the traitor. While the rest were making inquiries about the traitor, Judas remained silent and sullen; but after the

rest had gotten through, the defiant mocker nerved himself up to ask in a cold, formal way, "Rabbi, is it I?" The last words of warning which Jesus had given, did not touch the obdurate heart of the selfish Judas. Jesus now points him out. In this man the evil had triumphed over the good. His heart was darker than the darkness of the night into which he immediately plunged.

All persons look with contempt upon the name of Judas Iscariot, as they do that of Benedict Arnold. Why do we condemn these names? You never heard of a child named for either Judas Iscariot or Benedict Arnold. It is because their names are connected with events which have rendered them notorious. There are yet living as bad men as were they. Some could be found who would betray their country for less than did Arnold, and would betray their Master for less than thirty pieces of silver. At one time Judas appeared to perform the work of a faithful apostle. Like many other men, the handling of money developed in him an avaricious spirit. He expected a worldly kingdom and a high position in it. He knew his Master's miraculous power, and probably thought he would force him to set up his kingdom. He had become dissatisfied with the humble ways of Jesus, and wanted to place him where he would be compelled to assert his authority. When Judas saw the result of his treachery, he had no further use for the money, threw it down, and went and hanged himself.

Tender Words

After the departure of Judas, the spirits of Jesus and his disciples revived, as if relieved from a deadly incubus. The departing day of the Son of Man was as lovely as the coloring of a beautiful sunset. He looked forward to the terrible cross as the medium of glorification. Before parting from his disciples, he gave them a new commandment. As he had loved them, he commanded them also to love one another. In one sense it was not new; for Moses, in the law, said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Lev. 19:18). It was new, in the fact that it presented new motives. As he loved them, and they loved

him, they ought also to love one another. It was new in that it was to be a badge of disciple-ship; and they were to be known as his disciples because of the love they had one for another. It was to be greater than either faith or hope, and be the fulfilling of the law. The new commandment of Jesus is seen in the institutions for the blind, for the deaf and dumb, orphan schools and homes, so peculiar to Christians. Heathen nations do not understand these things.

Peter's Denial Foretold

Simon Peter understood that his Lord would die, and felt that he was willing to die with him. The apostle did not know at this time his own selfishness and skepticism. How startling indeed must have been these words: "The cock shall not crow until thou hast denied me thrice." It was already night, and before the dawn of the fatal morning appeared in the Eastern sky, Peter would thrice repudiate his Master in a most calumnious way. Simon, however, differed from Judas, in the fact that he sorely repented of his sin. Jesus tenderly forgave him, and restored him to his lost position. Judas had the sorrow of the world which led to suicide, but Simon Peter had godly sorrow, which led to his repentance unto life.

The Divine Teacher Comforting His Disciples
John 14:1-17

This conversation took place immediately after the institution of the Lord's Supper. It was not until its conclusion that we read of their leaving the room where the supper was instituted. At the passover Jerusalem was one of the brightest and happiest of cities. While there was universal rejoicing without, there was extreme sadness in the little band of the disciples. One of their number had proven traitor; and it was even known that the prince of the disciples would deny his master. Jesus had told them that he was going away, and the thought of parting with him whom they loved so well, had cast a gloom over the entire group.

A Future Home

Although in a few hours he would be in the extreme agony of Gethsemane, and never close his eyes again in sleep until he closed them in death, he spent his time in comforting his disciples. John Wesley showed the same spirit when asked what he would do if he knew that he would die on the morrow. In harmony with the sermon on the Mount, Jesus bids his disciples not to let their hearts be troubled. This language implies that we can have great control over our own troubles; and in the light of Christianity it is certainly not right for Christians to be fretting their life away. In God's word we find a sufficient source of consolation for every trial. The Divine Teacher had a perfect knowledge of the human heart.

I once heard a man remark that he had paid no attention to the future; that there was enough in this world for him to look after without troubling himself about the hereafter. Such language does not harmonize with the nature of man; for we are so constituted that we cannot live simply on the present. We cannot disconnect ourselves from the memory of the past and the hope of the future. It was the recompense of reward that caused Moses to reject his Egyptian crown, and become the leader of the Israelites at that time the slaves of Egypt. He knew that the pleasures of sin were transitory, that he could not enjoy them long; so he chose to suffer with God's people, for he looked forward to a recompense of reward. He looked for a city which hath for its foundation and maker, God. Even the distant patriarchs looked forward to the golden city. To comfort his disciples, the Divine Teacher pointed them to the future.

As the loving mother comforts her crying children when she is about to go from them, so Jesus comforts his disciples by assuring them that he would again come to them. It was necessary, however, for him to go away in order to prepare for them an eternal home. In this world they would have no permanent home; but in the Father's house they would have mansions which denote durability. The

disciples had expected a return of David's literal kingdom, but he promised them one more permanent. In the future kingdom there will be a mansion for each; and every faithful disciple will wear a crown of startling glory. It is not surprising that John, who heard this conversation, should afterwards say it does not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he appears we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. The disciples were greatly comforted in the prospects of such a home.

Jesus, the Way

It was very difficult for the disciples to give up their ardent hope of Messiah's earthly kingdom; and although they realized that his departure was at hand, they did not fully understand the meaning of his death. Thomas, who ever sought clearness and certainty, interrupted, and said, "Lord, we know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way?" Jesus reveals himself as the Way, the Truth and the Life, and as the only way to the glory of the Father. Jesus is the true way, for he speaks only the truth, he is the life, for he gives eternal life by raising us up at the last day.

Philip did not understand the language of Jesus, and thinking that he alluded to some appearance of the Father for the purpose of founding the earthly kingdom of the Messiah, and said, "Lord, show us the Father, and it suffices us." Jesus reminds him of the time he had been with him, and yet he did not seem to understand. He affirms plainly that those who knew him, knew his Father. He was God manifested in the flesh, and those who see him with the eye of faith, see the very image of Jehovah. It is necessary to put away earthly ideas, and let the inner man control, and become through Jesus the proper guide of life.

Their Future Guide

While it was necessary for Jesus to go away, he assures the disciples that he would not leave them comfortless. He would send the Helper and Counsellor who would abide

with them forever, the spirit of truth, who would guide them into all truth. The unbelieving world will reject him, because they have not so developed the inward sight as to know him. They will not receive anything that is invisible to the bodily eye; but those who believe in Jesus will know him, for he will be with them, and dwell in them. Jesus assures them that while he is going away, he will in spirit really be with them; that in their work of converting the world they might always expect his presence. While they had done great works during his personal presence, they would do even greater works under the guidance of the Spirit.

The Divine Teacher on the True Vine
John 15:1-16

It is thought by some that this beautiful allegory was given by Jesus to his disciples, while they were on their way from the supper-room to the garden of Gethsemane. Others think it was given before they started for their moonlight walk to the lonely garden; while they yet stood around their Lord after the Hallel was over. The allegory may have been suggested by the wine used at the supper, or they may have seen the silvery leaves of the vine as the moon shone upon them clustered around the latticed window.

The True Vine and its Branches

The true vine represents the Christ, and the branches represent the disciples. The Father is the husbandman. Many have been the sermons preached upon a false exegesis of this scripture. As the exegesis was false, these sermons were, of course, also false and misleading to the people. The vine has been made to represent the church, and the branches different branches of the church. Advocates for sectarian parties have thought that this passage of Scripture sustained their position. There is nothing more untrue, for this Scripture teaches exactly the opposite. Those who advocate denominationalism will have to go somewhere else to prove it except the fifteenth chapter of John.

Jesus is the vine and the disciples are the branches. The circulation of the vine sometimes becomes clogged, so that certain branches do not bring forth fruit; or sometimes all nourishing matter goes to leaves, and fruit is consequently not produced. Those that produce no fruit, the husbandman cuts off, so that they cannot injure the vine. The branches that bring forth fruit he prunes, so that they will produce more fruit. The point of analogy is this: those disciples, who cultivate the spiritual life they have derived from Christ, constantly receive new supplies of spiritual food, and produce more fruit; while those, who fail to cultivate their spiritual gifts, lose even what they already possess.

The Father of all,
The true vine doth cultivate;
From it is extracted the wine,
Which doth not intoxicate.

Jesus is the true vine,
The disciples are the branches;
He produces the true wine,
Which nourishes all the churches.

The Church of Christ is one,
As in the Father and the Son;
And an application of this unity,
Is the antidote for infidelity.

Jesus assured the disciples that they had been cleansed through the truth he had spoken to them. This was a great comfort to them, as their trial had been a sore one on account of the conduct of Judas. They had got rid of the traitor, and now all were clean. What remained for the disciples to do was to abide in the vine. This recognizes their free agency, and the importance of a loving obedience to the mandates of their Master. It is just as important for a disciple to abide in Christ as to be cleansed in the first place; and those who have been baptized, and think there is nothing more for them to do, are severely rebuked by the beautiful language of our Lord. The doctrine of Jesus is for all who love him to keep his commandments.

The True Mark of a Disciple

The only way to honor the Father is to abound in good works. Martin Luther made a great mistake in writing so much against works. Joseph Cook has severely criticised the position of the great reformer on the book of James. His position could not be made to harmonize with Paul, who teaches the importance of working out our own salvation. There is no conflict between Paul and James on justification by faith and works. Paul teaches justification without works of righteousness, or the deeds of the Jewish law; but not justification without obedience to Christ. He teaches us to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, which is in harmony with James, who says that we are not justified by faith only.

Love is the uniting bond of fellowship between the disciple and Christ and between Christ and his Father. Paul teaches that it is greater than either faith or hope, which with it form the beautiful trio so interestingly described by Paul in first Corinthians, thirteenth chapter. A man may have faith, and, still, not obey; but those who love Jesus will keep his commandments. Without love there can be no hope.

The Friends of Jesus

It was a custom among ancient kings to select a person, who was called the king's friend. In this friend the king imposed great confidence, and made known to him his secrets. Jesus applies this endearing term to all of his disciples. As they were all branches of the same vine, the love, which he had for them, they must also have for one another. This meant sacrifice, and even death when necessary. History furnishes examples of friends dying for each other. There is no greater test of friendship than this, and Jesus proposed to bear the test. He was willing to die for his friends.

It was a custom among Rabbis for disciples to select their teacher; but he had especially honored them in selecting them to be his disciples. If they would continue faithful,

he would show them a friendship, which the world had not before known. If they would keep his commandments, the Father would give them whatsoever, in harmony with his will they might ask in his name. Well do we find this promise fulfilled in the history of the apostolic church. It takes a great deal of training to tame a wild grape, so it requires much training to tame wild men and women. The gospel has fully proven its power to do this.

*The Divine Teacher Shown in His Great Intercessory Prayer
John 17.*

This prayer of Jesus is one of the most precious relics of the past. It contains the words of our Saviour in the very shadow of death. As he was both the victim and the High Priest, it is sometimes called the high priestly prayer. It has also been styled the intercessory prayer; because Jesus intercedes with his Father for his apostles and disciples. It is really the Lord's prayer, and the one commonly so called is the prayer Jesus taught his disciples. In this prayer Jesus shows marvelous calmness and tenderness directly in the face of death. He was perfectly confident of a triumph over the grave, and a cordial reception to his Father's right hand.

Jesus Prays for Himself

As the manner of their nation was, the apostles stood while Jesus prayed. He lifted up his eyes to heaven and said, "Father, the hour has come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son may also glorify thee." As thy Son has completed the work of redemption, which thou didst send him to do, now glorify him, that he may glorify thee as its author. In this way, all men may know its divine character. Glorify him in harmony with that will by which thou hast given him power over all men; for thou hast appointed him the only Saviour to carry out thy purpose of salvation towards the nations. Thus glorify him that he may give eternal life to all that thou hast given him. God gave him the nations for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession, so he was to offer, through his

death and resurrection, eternal life, as the gift of God to all who would accept it. God's plan of salvation embraces all nations, and Jesus came to establish a universal religion. There is a great difference between a universal religion and a universal salvation. A universal religion offers salvation to all, but does not compel any to accept. It respects the free agency of man. A universal salvation compels all men to accept it, and it destroys the freedom of the human will. God does not will concerning men as he does concerning stones. God's people must be willing.

It is eternal life to know God and his Son, Jesus Christ. To know God is to enjoy him, to be obedient to his will, and to live in blissful fellowship with him. This is the climax of happiness, and comprehends all good. To be at one with God is to possess the universe, and this is the result of that knowledge which Jesus alone can give. To know Jesus Christ is to believe and obey him. To obtain eternal life, then, we must have faith in Christ, and repent of our sins, and live in loving obedience to all his commandments.

Jesus Prays for His Apostles

He closed the prayer for himself, and now prays for his apostles. He had made known to them his Father's true character. They had a knowledge of God, when Jesus called them for they were of the house of Israel, but they did not understand his true character as Jesus had made it known to them. As he intended to leave them in an unbelieving world, he asked the Father to keep them in his own name. He knew that their peril would be great, and that they would be in much need of help, so he especially prays for the benedictions of his Father to rest upon them.

Jesus fully understood what was in man, and he knew the weak tendencies on the part of the disciples. They had recently had a dispute as to who should be greatest, and they were in danger of constant strifes. Jesus knew the prevalence of the carnal spirit with them, and wanted them to be brought into such spiritual relationship to the Father, and consequently with one another, that they might escape the perils which he could clearly foresee.

Jesus did not want the apostles taken out of the world, but to be kept from the evil. He had a work for them to do, and knew the world would hate them while they were doing it. The world loves its own, and as their principles would conflict with those of the world, he knew that they would suffer indignities and persecutions. Their work would be to preach the truth, and those who would hate the truth, would also hate its advocates.

Jesus Prays for All Believers

The apostles were sanctified in the truth, that they might preach the word of truth to all nations; and Jesus now prays for all who would become believers through the power of the gospel. This language clearly teaches that the word of truth is necessary in order to make believers.

The earnest prayer of Jesus for his disciples was that they might be one. He proposes to make them one flock under one shepherd. It is utterly impossible to harmonize the sectarian spirit of the religious world with the intercessory prayer of Jesus. The unity for which Jesus prayed is necessary in order to the conversion of the world. No one can question the fact that Sectarianism has been a fearful cause of infidelity. If all were one as are the Father and the Son, skepticism would be rapidly banished from this world. All professed Christians should ponder well the following language of their Master: "That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they may all be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

SECTION THREE

The Holy Spirit's Testimony to the Christ *John 15:15-16:33*

The special mission of the Holy Spirit was the glorification of the Christ. It is really difficult to translate the Greek word *par akleetos* into English. It is used several times in the New Testament, and always refers to the Holy Spirit except in one instance. In that it refers to

Christ himself as our *advocate* with the Father. Jesus promised the disciples to send them another Paraclete, which shows that he was their Paraclete while he was with them. The Holy Spirit is both an *advocate* and a *comforter*. He is an *advocate* in that he speaks through the apostles to the world, and a *comforter* in the fact that he is given to every disciple of Christ. At the time that Wycliff's version was made, the word *comforter* was used in the sense of *helper*. The Holy Spirit is a helper to every one who is truly a disciple of Christ.

Expedient For Jesus To Go Away

The disciples were so filled with sorrow that they did not ask Jesus the question about his departure that he wanted them to ask. They had not understood his previous words, or they would not have been so dejected, and he was anxious to comfort them by an explanation of the results of his departure. They were only thinking about his leaving, and not about the Comforter who was to come. It was expedient for him to depart, for he had accomplished his work. He had shown the omnipotence of God, but his work had been confined to narrow limits. He was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. It was different with the Paraclete who would manifest the omnipresence of God, and show to the world the universality of the kingdom of truth. None but the *advocate* could guide them into all truth.

The history of the apostolic work after the ascension of Jesus and the descent of the Holy Spirit confirms these words. The disciples walked by sight while Jesus lived, and it was necessary for him to go away, so that they might walk by faith. Only a crucified and risen Christ could be proclaimed as Lord of an eternal and spiritual kingdom. He had conquered death and the grave, and could be proclaimed as the victor over the prince of this world.

The Work of the Spirit

The first thing to be accomplished was to convince the world of sin. Only by help from above would the apostles

be able to do this, and drive out the reign of evil. Jesus saw no way of overcoming the evils of this world except by entering the dominions of the Prince of darkness, and conquering him on his own territory. This he triumphantly did, and took his seat at the Father's right hand in the heavens. The Holy Spirit was sent to testify to these facts, and convinced even the murderers of Jesus of the great sin they had committed against him. On the day of Pentecost three thousand of these skeptical Jews were pierced to the heart, and asked of the apostles the terms of pardon. Unbelief has been the great sin of all ages, and the gospel of Christ is its true antidote. If all professed Christians would preach the gospel as it was preached by the apostles, it would not be long until the world would be converted to Christ.

In the second place, the Holy Spirit convinces the world of righteousness,—that is, that Jesus was not sinful, but what he claimed to be, the Holy one of God. His righteousness is shown from the fact that he did not even shrink from the death of the cross, but in the fulfillment of his work sacrificed even his own life. His resurrection from the dead shows that his death was a voluntary act of love, and his return to the Father shows that he was God's Son, sent into the world to reconcile man to God. The Holy Spirit fully demonstrates God's righteous plan of justification and salvation.

Finally he would convince the world of judgment by the complete overthrow of the reign of Satan, and utter destruction of the works of darkness. In all his conflicts with Satan, Jesus was entirely triumphant. The powers of evil could form no coalition with him, and the promise of all the kingdoms of this world could not dissuade him from establishing one of the opposite character. He severely rebuked Satan in his own dominions by casting out demons and raising the dead. The death of Jesus was the last great act on the part of the Prince of Evil to destroy the purpose of his divine mission. He was utterly defeated by the resurrection of the Christ, which is a presage of the final overthrow of Satan's dominions.

The Return of Jesus

The apostles were greatly perplexed at the words of Jesus: "A little while, and ye shall not see me; and again a little while, and ye shall see me." They thought only of an earthly communion, such as they then enjoyed, and could not understand what he meant by their not seeing him in a short time, and in a little while seeing him again. His constant saying that he was going to his Father also perplexed them. They had not yet been sufficiently trained to see the spiritual meaning of his wonderful words. Jesus anticipated their perplexity, and explained to them the meaning of the mysterious words.

Jesus providently came to the disciples on the day of Pentecost. Then the Kingdom of God came with power. The destruction of Jerusalem is also called the coming of the Son of man. We must discriminate between these providential comings and the second personal coming of Christ. When Jesus returns personally to this earth, he will come in the clouds with the holy angels, and every eye shall see him, and even those who took part in his death. He promised his disciples that he would come again, after having prepared for them mansions in the heavens. The effort of the present age to explain away the second personal coming of Christ is mischievous in its tendency. The apostles and early Christians were greatly comforted in the assurance that Jesus would come again. Paul prayed that the whole body, soul and spirit might be preserved blameless until the coming of Christ. Jesus will certainly come again and revolutionize this planet.

From the facts we have had before us, we can reach no other conclusion than the fact that Christology is the Ultimate Theology. The highest ideals of which man is capable of forming a conception are found in the mission of the Christ. It is not possible to conceive of an ideal life superior to the actual life of the Son of God. The works of Jesus convinced the greatest intellects of his own age that he received special power from on high. His teachings also led the most thoughtful to the conclusion that no other man ever spake as did he. He went away, in

harmony with his own prediction, and sent the Holy Spirit, who accomplished exactly what Jesus said that he would accomplish. In this age of the world the Christianity of the Bible is the greatest force for good that the world has ever known. Scientists teach that this visible universe is temporal, and must ultimately pass into the great invisible universe; the Bible clearly teaches that the Christ will come at the end of the world, when the seen universe passes into the great unseen. Paul positively affirms that the seen universe is temporal, while the *great unseen* will be eternal.

